10 vols in 1 vol

£450

from the library of

Evelyn Philip SHIRLEY (1812-1882)
of Ettington Park Warwickshire
see DNB vol 52 page 124
binding with his initials & arms
stamped in gilt

Contents.

a Letter to a friend on Mr Ogl. by The Revd J. R. Matthews

a Letter to The Revd R. W. Jelf. D.D. in Explanation of Tract Nr 90. by the author. (Newman.) —

The Articles treated on in Tract 90 reconsidered & vindicated, by the Revd E. B. Pusey. D.D. —

are the Puritans sincere? by The Revd Joseph Rabbenet.

a Letter to The Bishop of Oxford, on occasion of Tract 90. by J. H. Newman. B.D.

The Subject of Tract 90, Examined, by The Revd Frederick Oakeley.

The Case of Catholic Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles considered, by The Revd John Keble. not published.

a Vindication of The Principles of The authors of The Tracts of the Times. by The Hon & Revd A. P. Perceval.

Remarks on the Necessity of attempting a Restoration of the National Church. by The Revd W. Gresley. —

a Letter on Catholic Unity. by Nicholas Bishop of Melipotamus. —

Ec: Pl: Sh:

A

LETTER,

&c.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

A

LETTER

TO A FRIEND,

ON THE

TRACT FOR THE TIMES,

No. 89.

BY THE

REV. S. R. MAITLAND,

LIBRARIAN TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1841.

A LETTER,

&c.

My Dear Friend,

Perhaps, like the rest of the world, you are so engrossed by No. 90, that you have paid little or no attention to No. 89. I do not know how long it has been published, but I presume it must have preceded the other, though it is only within a few days that it has fallen into my hands; and, not having seen it noticed in any quarter, I cannot but fear that what seems to me a very injurious publication, may be quietly stealing into circulation, while everybody is looking another way. If, however, you have seen it, you may very naturally expect to hear from me, whether I am led to recant opinions which have so often formed the subject of our conversation; and having maintained those opinions so long, and so publicly, before the Oxford Tracts were in existence,

I have little fear of being suspected of personal hostility, or of thrusting myself hastily into controversy, if I address you through the press, rather than by any more private method.

I am sorry that the author of the Tract has joined together, in one class, all those who have any fault to find with what has been, he tells us, impugned under the name of "ancient mysticism;" and still more sorry that he should view them all as "assailants of primitive antiquity," and persons disposed to rationalize. As far as my own observation enables me to judge, he has no right to assume that all those who object to any one of the three "heads of ancient mysticism," which he specifies, objects to them all, and are to be held up as persons led by "the Evil Spirit to decry the relics of Christian antiquity." I believe that greater knowledge of men would have taught him to distinguish, and would have saved him from injustice, of which I believe that he would not be advisedly guilty. He says:

"(5.) What now are the particulars of the Fathers' imputed Mysticism? *i. e.* in what respects would they be commonly charged with an undue anxiety to make out supernatural meanings and interferences? The following heads would seem to comprehend the greater part of their supposed delinquencies in this kind:—

1. Their interpretations of Scripture are said to be farfetched and extravagant; extracting figurative, theological allusions out of the most irrelevant or insignificant details of language or history.

2. Correspondent to this is their mode of treating natural objects, and the truths of philosophy and common life; fancying every where indications of that system, on which their own hearts were set.

3. They were mystics in their notions of providential interference, whether in the way of judgment, deliverance, or warning. To which head may be referred whatever they state of the exercise of the gift of prophecy in their times; as also their accounts of reputed miracles, and of the sensible agency of evil spirits, and of their own and others' warfare with them.

4. Finally, they are blamed for Mysticism, properly so called, in their moral and devotional rules; *i. e.* for dwelling too much on counsels of perfection, tending (as is affirmed) to contemplation rather than action, to monastic rather than social and practical virtue.

These are the sort of imputations on which the changes have been rung, for the two last centuries, by those who have wished to evade the testimony of the Fathers, without setting them down distinctly as deliberate impostors." p. 6.

I can imagine that, in the course of two centuries, some of all the persons who for one reason or other have "wished to evade the testimony of the Fathers," may have charged them with all this, and a great deal more; but if there be any who unite all these evil thoughts of the early Fathers, I need not tell you that I am not one of them, and offer no apology for them. For instance, and to take the distinction which meets us at the outset, I see no connexion between the practice of the Fathers in making allegorical interpretations, and their belief in super-

natural interferences; and I do not understand how the author of the Tract can do it, unless he considers their allegorical interpretations as the fruit of divine inspiration—an opinion which may be hinted in the otherwise obscure phrase, "supernatural meanings," but which I would not charge upon him without further and plainer evidence. It is to the former of these points, without in any way mixing it with the latter, that I desire at present to call your attention. Let me also premise that in what I am about to say, I am not laying hold of the words or principles of the author of the Tract, and applying them to some extreme case, picked out by myself; but only taking that which he has himself selected, and placed in the forefront of his work. Indeed I believe that you will not find in this letter a single allusion to anything in the Tract which is not contained within its first two and twenty pages.

After some pages of preparatory matter, the author says, "under such impressions, we may safely approach the first head, of Mysticism imputed to the Fathers, *viz.* their mode of interpreting Holy Scripture;" and his second section is thus headed:

"§ ii. *Specimen of Ancient Mysticism in interpreting Scripture.*"

And after stating the matter of fact, that the early Christian writers did use an allegorical way of interpreting Scripture, he proceeds:

"(2.) Let it then be taken for granted, that a mode of

expounding, which would seem to most men fanciful and strained, generally prevails in the Christian writers of the first centuries. The great point will be, to account in some measure for this fact. In order to which it may be expedient, not by way of proof but of illustration, if we take some one remarkable instance, and trace it as we may through the writings of some of the most eminent and earliest Fathers. And, not to give them any undue advantage, it may be well to select one of those subjects, their treatment of which is commonly considered most extravagant; a subject, which has attracted towards them in no common degree the contemptuous wonder of modern critics and philosophers: I mean, their discovering the tokens of our LORD's Passion, and more especially the Sign of the Cross, in innumerable places of the Old Testament, which neither are so expounded in the New, nor to common eyes betray of themselves any such allusion."—p. 15.

Then having selected as a specimen the epistle which is ascribed to St. Barnabas, and made some remarks on its date and character, and its fitness to be selected for such a purpose, he adds:

"(4.) As concerning the Passion and Cross of our LORD in particular, (to say nothing of the sacrifice of Isaac, the typical nature whereof, as it seems, no age of Christians has ever denied, notwithstanding the silence of Scripture,) St. Barnabas has the following passage[1]: "Israel being attacked by the aliens, with a view, amongst other things, of signifying to the people, that their transgressions were the cause of their being given over to death, the SPIRIT

[1] C. xii.

speaks inwardly to Moses, to form a type of the Cross, and of Him who was to suffer: that if men refuse to trust in Him, they will have no peace for ever. Moses therefore places one shield on another in the middle of the mound; and being thus posted high above all, he stretches out his hands, and so Israel began again to be victorious: afterwards, when on the contrary he let down his hands, again they were slaughtered. Wherefore? That men might know there is no chance of salvation, except they put their trust in Him. And in another Prophet he says, 'All the day long I have stretched forth my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people.'" p. 17.

On this I may briefly remark that here we have—perhaps in rather a small way, but yet worthy of notice for the sake of illustration—one of those injurious effects which I have long observed to flow from this allegorical mode of interpretation. It leads men to tamper with the Word of God; and either by addition, suppression, or some tortuous proceeding or other, to make it agree with their imagination. "People little know what they do," says the author of the Tract, "when they deal contemptuously with any thing, be it in Scripture or in common life, under the notion that it is too slight or insignificant for the ordering of the Most High." To this I heartily subscribe. Let me add my belief that the Scripture narratives were so given by inspiration, that people little know what they do when they add to them circumstances which may appear minute and trivial. It may perhaps be said that St. Barnabas (allow me

so to speak for the sake of brevity, without prejudice to the question whether the Apostle was really the author of the Epistle) knew by inspiration, or had learned by tradition, or had imagined in the lawful use of his poetical gift, that Moses placed one shield on another, though nothing of the kind is intimated in the book of Exodus. Well and good; if it is a new revelation, let him tell us so; if it is tradition, let him give it as such; if it is poetry, let there be some mark by which people may know it, for it looks like a mere statement of fact. But observe, I entreat you, that it is not brought before us under any such character; we are not talking about revelations, or traditions, or poetry, but of the *interpretation of Scripture*—and this, whatever it may be, gently slides in to take its place as Scripture, and to be interpreted with the rest. It is however, as I have said, a minor instance, and it is not worth while to dwell upon it.

The author of the Tract proceeds:

"What is very observable, the Author next goes on to mention, with just the same tone of confidence, and no more, the typical meaning of the Brasen Serpent; observing, with his usual piety, "Thou hast in this also the glory of JESUS; that in Him, and to Him, are all things."

It does [redacted] seem "very observable" that St. Barnabas should express no more confidence in this interpretation than in the other. Can it be accounted for, except by supposing him to have seen (what appears obvious enough) that our Lord's words gave

no authority for his mode of interpreting? Would he have disdained the sanction of our Lord, if he had thought that it was given? Perhaps he did not consider our Lord's illustration and his own interpretation as quite the same thing, though the author of the Tract appears to do so, for he goes on to say:

"Had it seemed good to God's providence, that the discourse of our Lord to Nicodemus should have been lost, as so many other of His divine words were, would not the Christian interpretation of this latter miracle have seemed to many forced and fanciful, just as that of the former may perhaps seem now? And ought not this single consideration to stop the mouths of all, who have any reverence in their hearts, when they find themselves tempted to join in hasty censure or scorn of such interpretations? For aught they know, they may be scorning or censuring the very lessons of our Divine Master Himself."

I should like to know more particularly whether the author really means to say, that if the words, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have eternal life," had been uttered by any uninspired person who knew the fact that our Lord should really be lifted up to save the suffering race of man, they could have seemed forced or fanciful? May I add that it is, so far as I have seen, very much the habit of the writers of the Tracts to inculcate profound reverence for all that is sacred, and to profess them-

selves deeply hurt and grieved even by such slight departures from it as persons not intentionally irreverent are liable to be guilty of; and may I suggest that a judgment on this point ought to be much influenced by the consideration of habit, education, natural disposition, or something else which certainly does produce among men who fear God and desire to please Him, and to treat with reverence everything belonging to his word and service, a great diversity of notion and feeling. I am sure that it was not so felt by the author of the Tract; but to myself the suggestion that men ought to listen to "such interpretations" as those of St. Barnabas, under the impression that "for aught they know," the interpretations were made by our Lord himself, appears highly irreverent and indecent. I am not claiming a right to join in "hasty scorn or censure;" but I suppose that a body of members of the University of Oxford would scarcely think it necessary to write to the clergy, to tell them that hasty censure and scorn are things which they should not indulge in, whatever the subject matter may be. I presume that something more than this is meant, though I do not pretend to say what.

To proceed, however, to another instance of what is called "Interpretation of Scripture," which is much more to the purpose, and much more important:—

"(12.) I proceed to another historical type, which to

many may appear more extravagant. The Author is reasoning on the history of Abraham, to prove the insufficiency of Jewish circumcision out of the Old Testament itself. So far, as will occur to every one, he is treading in the steps of St. Paul. After producing many passages to that purpose, he closes the subject with the following[1]: 'Consider whether there be not abundant instruction on this whole matter, in the account given us, that Abraham, who first gave men circumcision, did thereby perform a spiritual and typical action, looking forward to the Son: and that, upon receiving certain doctrines conveyed in three (mystical) letters. For He saith, Abraham circumcised of his house men to the number of three hundred and eighteen. What then is the mysterious truth thus vouchsafed to him? Observe the eighteen first, then the three hundred. Of the two letters which stand for 18, 10 is represented by I, 8 by H. Thou hast here the word Jesus:' *i. e.*, the two first letters, which formed as it were a cypher of the sacred Name, familiar to the eyes and thoughts of the Christians of that generation: as was also the third of the numeral letters in question, which the writer next goes on to explain: 'Because the Cross, which is signified to the eye by the letter Tau, was intended to bring the grace, [to which he looked forward;] he adds the three hundred also,' the letter Tau representing that number. 'By the two first letters then the name Jesus is indicated, and by the third the Cross.'"

If in anything that I have hitherto said, you have thought me hypercritical, yet I think you will agree with me, that here is something at which all persons

[1] Ep. S. Barnab. c. ix.

who have any respect for truth as truth, and any jealousy for the true interpretation of the written word of God, ought to make a stand and a protest. "For He saith, Abraham circumcised of his house men to the number of three hundred and eighteen." Who saith? The author of the Tract leaves us in no doubt, by printing the pronoun with a capital, and yet he knows that the word of God says no such thing. The simple fact, (known to the author of the Tract,) is, that when Abraham pursued Chedorlaomer, "he armed his trained servants, *born in his own house*, three hundred and eighteen[1]." When, more than thirteen (according to the common chronology, fifteen) years after, he circumcised "all the men of his house, *born in the house*, and *bought with money* of the stranger[2];" and, in fact, every male who was as much as eight days old, we are not told what the number amounted to. Shall we suppose (just for the sake of the interpretation) that Abraham's family had so dwindled in this interval, as that now all the males of his household, trained men, slaves, and children, equalled only and exactly the number of his warriors fifteen years before? Or, are we to suppose that the ancient writer confused the two passages, and imagined that the number mentioned in the one, had been mentioned in the other? It is easy, and I may sincerely add, very agreeable to my own feelings, thus to

[1] Gen. xiv. 14. [2] Gen. xvii. 23. 27.

acquit the writer of the epistle of anything bearing even the appearance of fraud in what lies at the root of his interpretation; for it must be remembered that it rests entirely on the *union* of the *number* 318 with the act of *circumcision*; but our business at present is rather with the modern apologist, who seems to be very far from imagining that there has been (perhaps I ought to say that there could be) any mistake in the case, or anything which should make us hesitate to receive this "genuine exposition," as one "not private, but ecclesiastical;" as a mystery, for the reality of which the writer might, with "no fanaticism, but with a great deal of sober piety and charity," appeal to Him "'from whom we' Christians or Christian teachers, 'derive the ingrafted gift of that teaching which is properly his[1].'" Let me ask your attention to what he says of it:—

"On this commentary, which as well as the former has been adopted by multitudes of the early interpreters[2], several remarks occur, which it may be well to put down, as they will each of them apply to a whole class of examples, and to difficulties which are certain to arise in many of our minds, though we were never so resolutely on our guard against prejudices of mere taste and association.

(13.) First, it may be observed that the several circum-

[1] P. 22.

[2] For example, St. Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 84; S. Ambr. de Fide, i. init. and § 121; S. Aug. Quæst. in Jud. 37; S. Hill. de Synod. 86.

stances, which may appear at first sight startling in this exposition, though not perhaps united in any one Scriptural example, have yet, each severally, undoubted sanction of Scripture. Thus, the use of the numeral letters as a cypher, to convey some mysterious truth, has a well-known precedent in the Book of Revelation." p. 18.

Surely you cannot but see in this an instance of what we have so often observed, as one of the worst effects of this allegorizing system. Those who habitually employ their minds in the study and generation of what is imaginary, are but too likely to lose sight of the real nature and just value of truth; and when they come to anything like argument, they betray the oddest notions imaginable. Precedent does for proof, and anything does for precedent. If they cannot find just what they want, it is quite, or seems to be quite enough for them that there is something like it somewhere. It is stated in a confessedly enigmatic prophecy, that a person shall be distinguished by the fact, that the number of his name shall be 666. I know not what theory the writer of the Tract holds on this obscure subject, but I no more believe that this is using "the numeral letters as a cypher," than I believe that if they were indisputably so used in that prophecy, it would give "undoubted Scripture sanction" to our finding out a great mystery in the number of Abraham's armed men, occurring in what seems to be a simple narrative of facts. But the author proceeds:—

"Again, the passage in St. Barnabas is an instance of the

combination of texts apparently remote, but really bearing on the same subject: for the number, three hundred and eighteen, is not mentioned in the account of the circumcision of Abraham's family, but is borrowed from the previous enumeration occasioned by the war with Chedorlaomer [1]. Now, this sort of combination of remote texts appears to be warranted, in one instance at least, by our blessed LORD Himself. 'Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer?' So far is taken from Isaiah, but the conclusion of the sentence, 'Ye have made it a den of thieves,' was addressed by Jeremiah to a subsequent generation [2].

"Now whether the fact were really so or not, (if it were, it was surely by special providence,) that Abraham's household at the time of circumcision was exactly the same number as before: still the argument of St. Barnabas will stand. As thus: circumcision had from the beginning a reference to our SAVIOUR, as in other respects, so in this; that the mystical number, which is the cypher of JESUS crucified, was the number of the first circumcised household, in the strength of which Abraham prevailed against the powers of the world. So St. Clement of Alexandria [3], as cited by Fell [4]: 'It is commonly supposed that we have here an indication of a correspondency between the case of Abraham's household and the method of salvation: of the victory obtained by those who have betaken themselves to the Holy Sign and Name, over those who led them captive, and the innumerable tribes of unbelievers, who follow in their train.'"

[1] Compare Gen. xvii. 27; xiv. 14.

[2] See Isai. lvi. 7; Jer. vii. 11.

[3] Strom. vi. 11.

[4] In loc. S. Barn.

Now what are we to say to this? Can we say less than that "the passage in St. Barnabas," is *not* a "combination of texts apparently remote, but really bearing on the same subject." *They do not bear on the same subject.* The one has no more to do with Chedorlaomer, than the other has to do with Circumcision. The one text is pregnant with contradiction of the interpretation which is attempted of the other; and the only "combination," is the picking a number out of one, and inserting it in the other. And "THIS SORT *of combination* of remote texts" appears to be warranted "by our blessed Lord Himself;" because He quoted a passage from the prophecy of Isaiah, and added a declaration, in language probably suggested by the prophecy of Jeremiah.

And it matters not to the argument, "whether the fact were *really* so or not."

And this is the mode of interpretation which the Author of the Tract would teach us. If it be the true one, may God enable us to receive it with humility and gratitude—if not, may we steadily banish and drive it away.

Yours, very faithfully,

S. R. MAITLAND.

LONDON:
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

THE REV. R. W. JELF, D.D.

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,

IN EXPLANATION OF No. 90,

IN THE SERIES CALLED

THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

BY THE AUTHOR.

SECOND EDITION.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER:

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

MDCCCXLI.

OXFORD: PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

A LETTER,

&c.

My Dear Dr. Jelf,

I have known you so many years that I trust I may fitly address the present pages to you, on the subject of my recent Tract, without its being suspected in consequence that one, who from circumstances has taken no share whatever in any of the recent controversies in our Church, is implicated in any approval or sanction of it. It is merely as a friend that I write to you, through whom I may convey to others some explanations which seem necessary at this moment.

Four Gentlemen, Tutors of their respective Colleges, have published a protest against the Tract in question. I have no cause at all to complain of their so doing, though as I shall directly say, I consider that they have misunderstood me. They do not, I trust, suppose that I feel any offence or soreness at their proceeding; of course I naturally think that I am right and they are wrong; but this persuasion is quite consistent both with my honoring their zeal for Christian truth and their anxiety for the welfare of our younger members, and with my very great consciousness that, even though I be right in my principle, I may have advocated truth in a wrong way. Such acts as theirs when done honestly, as they have done them, must benefit all parties,

and draw them nearer to each other in good will, if not in opinion. But to proceed to the subject of this letter.

I propose to offer some explanation of the Tract in two respects,—as to its principal statement and its object.

1. These Four Gentlemen, whom I have mentioned, have misunderstood me in so material a point, that it certainly is necessary to enter into the subject at some length. They consider that the Tract asserts that the Thirty-Nine Articles

"do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines of Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration of Images and Relics, the Invocation of Saints, and the Mass, as they are *taught authoritatively* by the Church of Rome, but only of certain absurd practices and opinions, which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do."

On the contrary I consider that they *do* contain a condemnation of the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome on these points; I only say that, whereas they were written before the decrees of Trent, they were not directed against those decrees. The Church of Rome taught authoritatively before those decrees, as well as since. Those decrees *expressed* her authoritative teaching, and they will continue to express it, while she so teaches. The simple question is, whether taken by themselves in their mere letter, they express it; whether in fact other senses, short of the sense conveyed in the present authoritative teaching of the Roman Church will not fulfil their letter, and may not even now in point of fact be held in that Church.

As to the present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, to judge by what we see of it in public, I think it goes very far indeed to substitute another Gospel for the true one. Instead of setting before the soul the Holy Trinity, and Heaven and Hell; it does seem to me, as a popular system, to preach the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, and Purgatory. If there ever was a system which required reformation, it is that of Rome at this day, or in other words (as I should call it) Romanism or Popery. Or, to use words in which I have only a year ago expressed myself, when contrasting Romanism with the teaching of the ancient Church,—

"In antiquity, the main aspect in the economy of redemption contains Christ, the Son of God, the Author and Dispenser of all grace and pardon, the Church His living representative, the Sacraments her instruments, Bishops her rulers, their collective decisions her voice, and Scripture her standard of truth. In the Roman Schools we find St. Mary and the Saints the prominent objects of regard and dispensers of mercy, Purgatory or Indulgences the means of obtaining it, the Pope the ruler and teacher of the Church, and miracles the warrant of doctrine. As to the doctrines of Christ's merits and eternal life and death, these are points not denied (God forbid), but taken for granted and passed by, in order to make way for others of more present, pressing, and lively interest. That a certain change then in objective and external religion has come over the Latin, nay, and in a measure the Greek Church, we consider to be a plain historical fact; a change . . . . . sufficiently startling to recal to our minds, with very unpleasant sensations, the awful words, 'Though we, or an Angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed.'"

On the doctrine of Purgatory, this received Romanism goes beyond the Decrees of Trent thus: the Council of Trent says,

"There is a Purgatory, and the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, and especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the Altar."

This definition does not explain the meaning of the word Purgatory—and it is not incompatible with the doctrine of the Greeks;—but the Catechism of Trent, which expresses the existing Roman doctrine says,

"There is a Purgatorial *fire*, in which the souls of the pious are *tormented* for a certain time, and expiated, in order that an entrance may lie open to them into their eternal home, into which nothing defiled enters."

And the popular notions go very far beyond this, as the extracts from the Homily, Jeremy Taylor, &c. in the Tract shew.

Again, the doctrine of Pardons is conveyed by the Divines of Trent in these words:—

"The use of Indulgences, which is most salutary to the Christian people, and approved by the authority of Councils, is to be retained in the Church;"

it does not explain what the word Indulgence means:—it is unnecessary to observe how very definite and how monstrous is the doctrine which Luther assailed.

Again, the Divines at Trent say that "to Images are to be paid due honour and veneration;" and to those who honour the sacred volume, pictures of

friends and the like, as we all do, I do not see that these very words of themselves can be the subject of objection. Far otherwise when we see the comment which the Church of Rome has put on them in teaching and practice. I consider its existing creed and popular worship to be as near idolatry as any portion of that Church can be, from which it is said that "the idols" shall be "utterly abolished."

Again, the Divines of Trent say that "it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints;" they do not even *command* the practice. But the actual honours paid to them in Roman Catholic countries, are in my judgment, as I have already said, a substitution of a wrong object of worship for a right one.

Again, the Divines at Trent say that the Mass is "a sacrifice truly propitiatory:" words which (considering they add, "The fruits of the Bloody Oblation are through this most abundantly obtained,—so far is the latter from detracting in any way from the former,") to my mind have no strength at all compared with the comment contained in the actual teaching and practice of the Church, as regards private masses.

This distinction between the words of the Tridentine divines and the authoritative teaching of the present Church, is made in the Tract itself, and would have been made in far stronger terms, had I not so very often before spoken against the actual state of the Church of Rome, or could I have anticipated the sensation which the appearance of the Tract has excited. I say,

"By 'the Romish doctrine' is not meant the Tridentine doctrine, because this article was drawn up before the decree of the Council of Trent. What *is* opposed is the *received doctrine of the day*, and *unhappily of this day too*, or the *doctrine of the Roman Schools*."—p. 24.

This doctrine of the Schools is at present, on the whole, the established creed of the Roman Church, and this I call Romanism or Popery, and against this I think the Thirty-nine Articles speak. I think they speak, not of certain accidental practices, but of a *body* and *substance* of divinity, and that traditionary, an existing ruling spirit and view in the Church; which, whereas it is a corruption and perversion of the truth, is also a very active and energetic principle, and, whatever holier manifestations there may be in the same Church, manifests itself in ambition, insincerity, craft, cruelty, and all such other grave evils as are connected with these.

Further, I believe that the decrees of Trent, though not *necessarily* in themselves tending to the corruptions which we see, yet considering these corruptions exist, will ever tend to foster and produce them, as if principles and elements of them—that is, while these decrees remain unexplained in any truer and more Catholic way.

The distinction I have been making, is familiar with our controversialists. Dr. Lloyd, the late Bishop of Oxford, whose memory both you and myself hold in affection and veneration, brings it out strongly in a review which he wrote in the British Critic in 1825. Nay he goes further than any thing I have said on one point, for he thinks the

Roman Catholics are not what they once were, at least among ourselves. I pronounce no opinion on this point; nor do I feel able to follow his revered guidance in some other things which he says, but I quote him in proof that the Reformers did not aim at decrees or abstract dogmas, but against a living system, and a system which it is quite possible to separate from the formal statements which have served to represent it.

"Happy was it," he says, "for the Protestant controversialist, when his own eyes and ears could bear witness to the doctrine of Papal satisfactions and meritorious works, when he could point to the benighted wanderer, working his way to the shrine of our Lady of Walsingham or Ipswich, and hear him confess with his own mouth, that he trusted to such works for the expiation of his sins; or when every eye could behold 'our churches full of images, wondrously decked and adorned, garlands and coronets set on their heads, precious pearls hanging about their necks, their fingers shining with rings, set with precious stones; their dead and still bodies, clothed with garments stiff with gold.'" *Hom.* 3. *ag. Idol.* p. 97.

On the other hand he says:

"Our full belief is that the Roman Catholics of the United Kingdom, from their long residence among Protestants, their disuse of processions and other Romish ceremonies, have been brought gradually and almost unknowingly to a more spiritual religion and a purer faith,—that they themselves see with sorrow the disgraceful tenets and principles that were professed and carried into practice by their forefathers,—and are too fond of removing this disgrace from them, by denying the former existence of these tenets, and ascribing the imputation of them to the calumnies of the Protestants. This we cannot allow; and

while we cherish the hope that they are now gone for ever, we still assert boldly and fearlessly, that they did once exist." p. 148.

Again:

"That latria is due only to the Trinity, is continually asserted *in the Councils;* but the terms of dulia and hyperdulia, *have not been adopted or acknowledged by them in their public documents;* they are, however, *employed unanimously by all the best writers of the Romish Church,* and their use is maintained and defended by them." p. 101.

I conceive that what "all the best writers" say is authoritative teaching, and a sufficient object for the censures conveyed in the Articles, though the decrees of Trent, taken by themselves, remain untouched.

"This part of the enquiry" [to define exactly the acts peculiar to the different species of worship] "however is more theoretical than useful; and, as every thing that can be said on it must be derived, *not from Councils,* but from *Doctors* of the Romish Church, whose authority would be called in question, it is not worth while to enter upon it now. And therefore, observing only that the *Catechism of Trent* still retains the term of, *adoratio angelorum,* we pass on, &c." p. 102.

Again:

"On the question whether the Invocation of Saints, professed and practised by the Church of Rome, is idolatrous or not, our opinion is this; that in *the public Formularies* of their Church, and even in the belief and practice of the best informed among them, there is *nothing of idolatry,* although, as we have said, we deem that practice altogether unscriptural and unwarranted; but we

do consider the principles relating to the worship of the Virgin, calculated to lead in the end to positive idolatry; and we are well convinced, and we have strong grounds for our conviction, that a large portion of the lower classes are in this point guilty of it. Whether the Invocation of Angels or of Saints has produced the same effect, we are not able to decide." p. 113.

I accept this view entirely with a single explanation. By "principles" relating to the worship of the Blessed Virgin, I understand either the *received* principles as distinct from those laid down in the Tridentine statements; or the principles contained in those statements, viewed as *practically* operating on the existing feelings of the Church.

Again:

"She [the Church of England] is unwilling to fix upon the *principles* of the Romish Church the charge of positive idolatry; and contents herself with declaring that 'the Romish doctrine concerning the Adoration as well of Images as of Relics, is a fond thing, &c. &c.' But in regard to the universal *practice* of the Romish Church, *she adheres to the declaration of her Homilies;* and professes her conviction that this fond and unwarranted and unscriptural doctrine has at all times produced, and will hereafter, as long as it is suffered to prevail, produce the sin of *practical* idolatry." p. 121.

I will add my belief that the only thing which can stop this tendency in the decrees of Rome, as things are, is its making some formal declaration the other way.

Once more:

"We reject the second [Indulgences] not only because they are altogether unwarranted by any word of Holy

Writ, and contrary to every principle of reason, but because we conceive the *foundations* on which they rest to be, in the highest degree, blasphemous and absurd. These *principles* are, 1. that the power of the Pope, great as it is, does not properly extend beyond the limits of this present world. 2. That the power which he possesses of releasing souls from Purgatory arises out of the treasure committed to his care, a treasure consisting of the supererogatory merits of our blessed Saviour, the Virgin, and the Saints . . . . . This is the treasure of which Pope Leo, in his Bull of the present year, 1825, speaks in the following terms: 'We have resolved, in virtue of the authority given to us by Heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure, composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of His Virgin Mother, and of all the Saints, which the Author of human salvation has entrusted to our dispensation.'" p. 143.

This is what our Article means by Pardons; but it is more than is said in the Council of Trent.

And Bramhall:

"A comprecation [with the Saints] both the Grecians and we do allow; an ultimate invocation both the Grecians and we detest; so do the Church of Rome *in their doctrine*, but they vary from it in their practice." Works, p. 418.

And Bull:

"This Article [the Tridentine] of a Purgatory after this life, *as it is understood* and *taught* by the Roman Church (*that is*, to be a place and state of misery and torment, whereunto many faithful souls go presently after death, and there remain till they are thoroughly purged from their dross, or *delivered thence by Masses, Indulgences*, &c.) is contrary to Scripture, and the sense of the Catholic Church for at least the first four Centuries, &c." *Corrupt. of Rom.* §. 3.

And Wake:

"The Council of Trent has spoken *so uncertainly* in this point [of Merits] as plainly shews that they in this did not know themselves, what they would establish, or were unwilling that others should." *Def. of Expos.* 5.

I have now said enough on the point of distinction between the existing creed, or what the Gentlemen who signed the protest call the "authoritative teaching" of the Church of Rome, and its decrees. And while this distinction seems acknowledged by our controversialists, it is a *fact* that our Articles were written *before* those decrees, and therefore are levelled not against them, but against the authoritative teaching.

I will put the subject in another way, which will lead us to the same point. If there is one doctrine more than another which characterizes the present Church of Rome, and on which all its obnoxious tenets depend, it is the doctrine of its *infallibility*. Now I am not aware that this doctrine is any where embodied in its formal decrees. Here then is a critical difference between its decrees and its received and established creed. Any one who believed that the Pope and Church of Rome are the essence of the infallibility of the Catholic Church, ought to join their communion. If a person remains in our Church, he thereby disowns the infallibility of Rome —and is its infallibility a slight characteristic of the Romish, or Romanistic, or Papal system, by whatever name we call it? is it not, I repeat, that on which all the other errors of its received teaching depend?

The Four Gentlemen

"are at a loss to see what security would remain, were his [the writer's] principles generally recognised, that the most plainly erroneous doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome might not be inculcated in the Lecture Rooms of the University and from the Pulpits of our Churches."

Here is a doctrine, which could not enter our Lecture Rooms and Pulpits—Rome's infallibility—and if this is excluded, then also are excluded those doctrines which depend, I may say, solely on it, not on Scripture, not on reason, not on antiquity, not on Catholicity. For who is it that gives the doctrine of Pardons their existing meaning which our Article condemns? The Pope; as in the words of Leo in 1825, as above quoted from Bishop Lloyd. Who is it that has exalted the honour of the Blessed Virgin into worship of an idolatrous character? The Pope; as when he sanctioned Bonaventura's Psalter. In a word, who is the recognised interpreter of all the Councils but the Pope?

On this whole subject I will quote from a work, in which, with some little variation of wording, I said the very same thing four years ago without offence.

"There are in fact two elements in operation within the system. As far as it is Catholic and Scriptural, it appeals to the Fathers; as far as it is a corruption, it finds it necessary to supersede them. Viewed in its *formal principles* and authoritative statements, it professes to be the champion of past times; viewed as an active and political power, as a ruling, grasping, and ambitious principle, in a word, what is expressively called Popery, it exalts the will and

pleasure of the existing Church above all authority, whether of Scripture or Antiquity, interpreting the one and disposing of the other by its absolute and arbitrary decree. . . . We must deal with her as we would towards a friend who is visited by derangement . . . she is her real self only in name. . . . Viewed as a practical system, its main tenet, which gives a colour to all its parts, is the Church's infallibility, as, on the other hand the principle of that genuine theology out of which it has arisen, is the authority of Catholic antiquity." —On Romanism, pp. 102—4.

Nothing more then is implied in the Tract than that Rome is *capable* of a reformation; its corrupt system indeed cannot be reformed; it can only be destroyed; and that destruction is *its* reformation. I do not think that there is any thing very erroneous or very blameable in such a belief; and it seems to be a very satisfactory omen in its favour, that at the Council of Trent such protests, as are quoted in the Tract, were entered against so many of the very errors and corruptions which our Articles and Homilies also condemn. I do not think it is any great excess of charity towards the largest portion of Christendom, to rejoice to detect such a point of agreement between them and us, as a joint protest against some of their greatest corruptions, though they in practice cherish them, though they still differ from us in other points besides. That I have not always consistently kept to this view in all that I have written, I am well aware; yet I have made very partial deviations from it.

I should not be honest if I did not add, that I con-

sider our own Church, on the other hand, to have in it a traditionary system, as well as the Roman, beyond and beside the letter of its formularies, and to be ruled by a spirit far inferior to its own nature. And this traditionary system, not only inculcates what I cannot receive, but would exclude any difference of belief from itself. To this exclusive modern system, I desire to oppose myself; and it is as doing this, doubtless, that I am incurring the censure of the Four Gentlemen who have come before the public. I want certain points to be left open which they would close. I am not speaking for myself in one way or another; I am not examining the scripturalness, safety, propriety, or expedience of the points in question; but I desire that it may not be supposed to be utterly unlawful for such private Christians as feel they can do it with a clear conscience, to allow a comprecation with the Saints as Bramhall does; or to hold with Andrewes that, taking away the doctrine of Transubstantiation from the Mass, we shall have no dispute about the Sacrifice; or with Hooker to treat even Transubstantiation as an opinion which by itself need not cause separation; or to hold with Hammond that no General Council, truly such, ever did, or shall err in any matter of faith; or with Bull, that man was in a supernatural state of grace before the fall, by which he could attain to immortality, and that he has recovered it in Christ; or with Thorndike, that works of humiliation and penance are requisite to render God again propitious to those who fall from the grace of Baptism; or with Pearson that the Name of Jesus

is no otherwise given under Heaven than in the Catholic Church.

In thus maintaining that we have open questions, or as I have expressed it in the Tract "ambiguous Formularies," I observe, first, that I am introducing no novelty. For instance, it is commonly said that the Articles admit both Arminians and Calvinists; the *principle* then is admitted, as indeed the Four Gentlemen, whom I have several times noticed, themselves observe. I do not think it a greater latitude than this, to admit those who hold, and those who do not hold, the points above specified.

Nor, secondly, can it be said that such an interpretation throws any uncertainty upon the primary and most sacred doctrines of our religion. These are consigned to the Creed; the Articles did not define them; they existed before the Articles; they are referred to in the Articles as existing *facts*, just as the broad Roman errors are referred to; but the decrees of Trent were drawn up after the Articles.

On these two points, I may be allowed to quote what I said four years ago in a former Tract.

"The meaning of the Creed . . . is known; there is no opportunity for doubt here; it means but one thing, and he who does not hold that one meaning, does not hold it at all. But the case is different (to take an illustration) in the drawing up of a Political Declaration or a Petition to Parliament. It is composed by persons, differing in matters of detail, agreeing together to a certain point and for a certain end. Each narrowly watches that nothing is inserted to prejudice his own particular opinion, or stipulates for the insertion of what may rescue it. Hence

general words are used, or particular words inserted, which by superficial enquirers afterwards are criticised as vague and indeterminate on the one hand, or inconsistent on the other; but in fact, they all have a meaning and a history, could we ascertain it. And if the parties concerned in such a document are legislating and determining for posterity, they are respective representatives of corresponding parties in the generations after them. Now the Thirty-Nine Articles lie between these two, between a Creed and a mere joint Declaration; to a certain point they have one meaning, beyond that they have no one meaning. They have one meaning so far as they embody the doctrine of the Creed; they have different meanings, so far as they are drawn up by men influenced by the discordant opinions of the day." *Tract* 82.

These two points—that our Church allows (1.) a great diversity in doctrine, (2.) except as to the Creed,—are abundantly confirmed by the following testimonies of Bramhall, Laud, Hall, Taylor, Bull, and Stillingfleet, which indeed go far beyond any thing I have said.

For instance, Bull:

"What next he [a Roman Catholic objector] saith concerning our notorious prevarication from the Articles of our Church, I do not perfectly understand. He very well knows, that all our Clergy doth still subscribe them: and if any man hath dared openly to oppose the declared sense of the Church of England in any one of those Articles, he is liable to ecclesiastical censure, which would be more duly passed and executed, did not the divisions and fanatic disturbances, first raised and still fomented by the blessed emissaries of the Apostolic See, hinder and blunt the edge of our discipline. But possibly he intends that latitude of sense, which our Church, as an indulgent mother, allows

her sons in some abstruser points, (such as Predestination, &c.) not particularly and precisely defined in her Articles, but in general words capable of an indifferent construction. If this be his meaning, this is so far from being a fault, that it is the singular praise and commendation of our Church. As for our being concluded by the Articles of our Church, if he means our being obliged to give our internal assent to every thing delivered in them upon peril of damnation, it is confessed that few, yea none of us, that are well advised, will acknowledge ourselves so concluded by them, nor did our Church ever intend we should. For she professeth not to deliver all her Articles (all I say, for *some* of them are coincident with the *fundamental* points of Christianity) as essentials of faith, without the belief whereof no man can be saved; but only propounds them as a body of safe and pious principles, *for the preservation of peace to be subscribed*, and not openly contradicted by her sons. And therefore she requires subscription to them only from the Clergy, and not from the laity, who yet are obliged to acknowledge and profess all the fundamental Articles of the Christian faith, no less than the most learned Doctors. This hath often been told the Papists by many learned writers of our Church. I shall content myself (at present) only with two illustrious testimonies of two famous Prelates. The late terror of the Romanists, Dr. Usher, [Bramhall?] the most learned and reverend Primate of Ireland, thus expresseth the sense of the Church of England, as to the subscription required to the Thirty-Nine Articles; 'We do not suffer any man to reject the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England at his pleasure, yet neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving faith, or legacies of Christ and His Apostles; but in a mean, as pious opinions, *fitted for the preservation of peace and unity; neither do we oblige any man to believe them*, but only not to contradict them.' So the excellent Bishop Hall, in his *Catholic Propositions*, (truly so called,)

denieth, in general, that any Church can lawfully propose any Articles to her sons, besides those contained in the common rule of faith, to be believed under pain of damnation. His third proposition is this; 'The sum of the Christian faith are those principles of the Christian religion, and fundamental grounds and points of faith, which are undoubtedly contained and laid down in the canonical Scriptures, whether in express terms or by necessary consequence, and in the ancient Creeds universally received and allowed by the whole Church of God."

And then in the seventh and eighth Propositions, he speaks fully to our purpose.—*Prop.* 7. 'There are and may be many theological points, which are wont to be believed and maintained, and so may lawfully be, of this or that particular Church, or the Doctors thereof, or their followers, as godly doctrines and profitable truths, besides those other essential and main matters of faith, without any prejudice at all of the common peace of the Church.' Prop. 8. 'Howsoever it may be lawful for learned men and particular Churches to believe and maintain those probable or (as they may think) certain points of theological verities, yet *it is not lawful for them to impose and obtrude the same doctrines upon any Church or person,* to be believed and held, as upon the necessity of salvation; or to anathematize or eject out of the Church any person or company of men that think otherwise.'

"As for the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, undoubtedly delivered in the Scriptures, and allowed (except the Romanists, who have so affected singularity, as to frame to themselves a new Christianity) by the whole Church of God, they are by the consent of all Christians acknowledged to be contained in that called the Creed, or rule of faith.

"This rule of faith, and that also as it is more fully explained by the first General Councils, our Church heartily embraceth, and hath made a part of her Liturgy, and so

hath obliged all her sons to make solemn profession thereof. To declare this more distinctly to your ladyship, our Church receiveth that which is called the Apostles' Creed, and enjoins the public profession thereof to all her sons in her daily Service. And if this Creed be not thought express enough fully to declare the sense of the Catholic Church in points of necessary belief, and to obviate the precise interpretations of heretics, she receiveth also that admirable summary of the Christian faith, which is called the Nicene Creed, (but is indeed the entire ancient Creed of the Oriental Churches, together with the necessary additional explications thereof, made by Fathers both of the Council of Nice against Arius, and the Council of Constantinople against Macedonius,) the public profession whereof she also enjoins all her sons (without any exception) to make in the Morning Service of every Sunday and holy day. This creed she professeth (consentaneously to her own principles) to receive upon this ground primarily, because she finds that the articles thereof may be proved by most evident testimonies of Scripture; although she deny not, that she is confirmed in her belief of this Creed, because she finds all the articles thereof, in all ages, received by the Catholic Church." *Vindication of the Church of England*, 27.

And Stillingfleet:

"The Church of England makes no Articles of Faith, but such as have the testimony and approbation of the whole Christian world of all ages, and are acknowledged to be such by Rome itself, and in other things she requires *subscription* to them not as Articles of Faith, but as Inferior Truths which she expects a submission to, *in order to her Peace and Tranquillity.* So the late learned L. Primate of Ireland [Bramhall] often expresseth the sense of the Church of England, as to her Thirty-Nine Articles. 'Neither doth the Church of England,' saith he, 'define

any of these questions, as necessary to be believed, either necessitate medii, *or* necessitate præcepti, which is much less; *but only bindeth her sons for peace sake, not to oppose them.*' And in another place more fully. We do not suffer any man to reject the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England at his pleasure; yet neither do we look upon them as Essentials of saving Faith, or Legacies of Christ and His Apostles: but in a mean, *as pious Opinions fitted for the preservation of Unity; neither do we oblige any man to believe them,* but only not to contradict them.' By which we see, what a vast difference there is between those things which are required by the Church of England, *in order to Peace;* and those which are imposed by the Church of Rome, as part of that Faith, *extra quam non est salus,* without the belief of which there is no salvation. In which she hath as much violated the Unity of the Catholic Church, as the Church of England by her Prudence and Moderation hath studied to preserve it." *Grounds of Protestant Rel.* part i. chap. 11.

And Laud:

"A. C. will prove the Church of England a Shrew, and such a Shrew. For in her Book of Canons she excommunicates every man, who shall hold any thing contrary to any part of the said Articles. So A. C. But surely these are not the very words of the Canon nor perhaps the sense. Not the words; for they are: Whosoever shall affirm that the Articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous, &c. And perhaps not the sense. For it is one thing for a man to *hold an opinion privately within himself,* and another thing *boldly and publicly to affirm it.* And again, 'tis one thing to hold contrary to some part of an Article, which perhaps may be but in the manner of Expression, and another thing positively to affirm, that the Articles in any part of them are superstitious, and erroneous. *On Tradition,* xiv. 2.

And Taylor:—

"I will not pretend to believe that those doctors who first framed the article, did all of them mean as I mean; I am not sure they did, or that they did not; but this I am sure, that they framed the words with much caution and prudence, and so as might abstain from grieving the contrary minds of differing men. . . . . It is not unusual for Churches, in matters of difficulty, to frame their articles so as *to serve the ends of peace*, and yet not to endanger truth, or to destroy liberty of improving truth, or a further reformation. And since there are so very many questions and opinions in this point, either all the Dissenters must be allowed to reconcile the Article and their opinion, or must refuse her communion; which whosoever shall enforce, is a great schismatic and an uncharitable man. This only is certain, that to tie the article and our doctrine together, is an excellent art of peace, and a certain signification of obedience; and yet is a security of truth, and that just liberty of understanding, which, because it is only God's subject, is then sufficiently submitted to men, when we consent in the same form of words."—*Further Explic. Orig. Sin.* § 6.

This view of the Articles conveyed in these extracts evidently allows, as I have said above, of much greater freedom in the private opinions of individuals, subscribing them, than I have contended for.

While I am on this subject, I will make this remark in addition:—That though I consider that the wording of the Articles is wide enough to admit persons of very different sentiments from each other in detail, provided they agree in some broad general sense of them, (*e. g.* differing from each other whether or not there is *any* state of purification

after death, or whether or not *any* addresses are allowable to Saints departed, so that they one and all condemn the Roman doctrine of Purgatory and of Invocation as actually taught and carried into effect,) yet I do not leave the Articles without their *one legitimate sense* in preference to all other senses. The only peculiarity of the view I advocate, if I must so call it, is this,—that, whereas it is usual at this day to make the particular *belief of their writers* their true interpretation, I would make the *belief of the Catholic Church* such. That is, as it is often said that infants are regenerated in Baptism, not on the faith of their *parents* but of the *Church*, so in like manner I would say the Articles are received, not in the sense of their framers, but (as far as the wording will admit or any ambiguity requires it,) in the one Catholic sense. For instance as to Purgatory, I consider (with the Homily) that the Article opposes the main idea really encouraged by Rome, that temporary punishment is a substitute for hell in the case of the unholy, and all the superstitions consequent thereupon. As to Invocation, that the Article opposes, not every sort of calling on beings short of God, (for certain passages in the Psalms are such) but all that *trenches on worship*, (as the Homily puts it,) the question whether *ora pro nobis* be such, being open,—not indifferent indeed, but a most grave and serious one for any individual who feels drawn to it, but still undecided by the Article. As to Images, the Article condemns all approach to idolatrous regard, such as Rome does in point of fact encourage. As to the Mass, all that impairs or

obscures the doctrine of the one Atonement, once offered, which Masses, as observed in the Church of Rome, actually have done.

2. And now, if you will permit me to add a few words more, I will briefly state *why* I am anxious about securing this liberty for us.

Every one sees a different portion of society; and, judging of what is done by its effect upon that portion, comes to very different conclusions about its utility, expedience, and propriety. That the Tract in question has been very inexpedient as addressed to one class of persons is quite certain; but it was meant for another, and I sincerely think is necessary for them. And in giving the reason, I earnestly wish even those who do not admit or feel it, yet to observe that I *had* a reason.

In truth there is at this moment a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century. I always have contended, and will contend, that it is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals on a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any Church system, still all bear witness to it. Mr. Alexander Knox in Ireland bears a most surprising witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards

something, and most unhappily the one religious communion among us which has of late years been practically in possession of this something, is the Church of Rome. She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called Catholic. The question then is, whether we shall give them up to the Roman Church or claim them for ourselves, as we well may, by reverting to that older system, which has of late years indeed been superseded, but which has been, and is, quite congenial (to say the least), I should rather say proper and natural, or even necessary to our Church. But if we do give them up, then we must give up the men who cherish them. We must consent either to give up the men, or to admit their principles.

Now, I say, I speak of what especially comes under my eye, when I express my conviction that this is a very serious question at this time. It is not a theoretical question at all. I may be wrong in my conviction, I may be wrong in the mode I adopt to meet it, but still the Tract is grounded on the belief that the Articles *need* not be so closed as the received method of teaching closes them, and *ought* not to be for the sake of many persons. If we will close them, we run the risk of subjecting persons whom we should least like to lose or distress, to the temptation of joining the Church of Rome, or to the necessity of withdrawing from the Church as established, or to the misery of

subscribing with doubt and hesitation. And, as to myself, I was led especially to exert myself with reference to this difficulty, from having had it earnestly urged upon me by parties I revere, to do all I could to keep members of our Church from straggling in the direction of Rome; and, not being able to pursue the methods commonly adopted, and being persuaded that the view of the Articles I have taken is true and honest, I was anxious to set it before them. I thought it would be useful to them, without hurting any one else.

I have no wish or thought to do more than to claim an admission for these persons to the right of subscription. Of course I should rejoice if the members of our Church were all of one mind; but they are not; and till they are, one can but submit to what is at present the will, or rather the chastisement, of Providence. And let me now implore my brethren *to* submit, and not to force an agreement at the risk of a schism.

In conclusion, I will but express my great sorrow that I have at all startled or offended those for whom I have nothing but respectful and kind feelings. That I am startled myself in turn, that persons, who have in years past and present borne patiently disclaimers of the Athanasian Creed, or of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, or of belief in many of the Scripture miracles, should now be alarmed so much, when a private Member of the University, without his name, makes statements in an opposite direction, I must also avow. Nor can I repent of what I have published. Still, whatever has

been said, or is to be done in consequence, is, I am sure, to be ascribed to the most conscientious feelings; and though it may grieve me, I trust it will not vex me, or make me less contented and peaceful in myself.

Ever yours most sincerely,

J. H. N.

Saturday,
March 13*th*, 1841.

It may be necessary to notice one or two inaccuracies in the Tract. Such is a quotation from Bp. Andrewes, instead of one from Bp. Ken; and the word *Angel* for *Spirit*, in page 36, (though the passage itself perhaps had better have been omitted,) and *Ratification* for *Declaration*, in page 80.

¶ Since the above was in type, it has been told me that the Hebdomadal Board has recorded its opinion about the Tract.

POSTSCRIPT.

I am led by circumstances, in order to explain the Tract more fully, to add:

1. That I have most honestly stated in the above Letter what was intended, though not expressed in the Tract, about the actual dominant errors of the Church of Rome. The Tract was no *feeler*, as it is called, put forth to see how far one might go without notice, nor is the Letter a retractation. Those who are immediately about me, know that in the interval between the printing and publication of the Tract, I was engaged in writing some Letters about Romanism in which I spoke of the impossibility of any approach of the English towards the Roman Church, arising out of the present state of the latter, as strongly as I did a year ago, or as I do now in my Letter.

2. Again as to the object of my Pamphlet. I can declare most honestly that my reason for writing and publishing it, without which I should not have done it, and which was before my mind from first to last, was, as I have stated it in my Letter, the quieting the consciences of persons who considered (falsely as I think) that the Articles prevent them holding views found in the Primitive Church. That while I was writing it, I was not unwilling to shew that the Decrees of Trent were but partially, if at all, committed to certain popular errors, I fully grant; but even this I did with reference to others.

In explanation of the sensation which the Tract has caused (as far as it arises from the Tract itself), I observe:

1. The Tract was addressed to one set of persons, and has been used and commented on by another.

2. As its Author had very frequently and lately entered his protest against many things in the Roman system, he

did not see that it was necessary to repeat them, when that system did not form the direct object of the Tract; and the consciousness how strongly he had pledged himself against Rome, as it is, made him, as persons about him know full well, quite unsuspicious of the possibility of any sort of misunderstanding arising out of his statements in it.

3. Those who had happened to read his former publications, understanding him to *identify* rather than *connect* the decrees of Trent with the peculiar Roman errors, were led perhaps to think, that in speaking charitably of those decrees he was speaking tenderly of those errors. And it must be confessed that, though he has uniformly maintained the existence of the errors in the Church of Rome both before and after the Tridentine Council, yet he has sometimes spoken of the decrees rather as the essential development, than the existing symbol and index of the errors.

4. There was, confessedly, a vagueness and deficiency in some places as to the conclusions he would draw from the premises stated, and a consequent opening to the charge of a disingenuous understatement of the contrariety between the Articles and the actual Roman system. This arose in great measure from his being more bent on laying down his principle than defining its results.

5. It arose also from the circumstance that, the main drift of the Tract being that of illustrating the Articles from the *Homilies*, the doctrines of the Articles are sometimes brought out only so far as the Homilies explain them, which is in some cases an inadequate representation.

I will add, moreover, 1. That in the expression "ambiguous Formularies," I did not think of referring to the Prayer Book. And I suppose all persons will grant, that if the Articles treat of Predestination, and yet can be signed by Arminians and Calvinists, they are not clear on all points. But I gladly withdraw the phrase. And I express now, as I often have done before, my great veneration for those

ancient forms of worship which, by God's good providence, are preserved to us.

2. That I did not mean at all to assert that persons called High-Churchmen have a difficulty in holding Catholic principles consistently with a subscription to the Articles; on the contrary, I observe in the Tract, that "the objection" on this score "is groundless;" yet that there are many who have felt it, however causelessly, I know, and certainly *have* said.

3. That I had no intention whatever of implying that there are not many persons of Catholic views in our Church, and those more worthy of consideration than myself, who deny that the Reformers were uncatholic. I consider the question quite an open one.

4. That, in implying that certain modified kinds of Invocation, veneration of Relics, &c. might be Catholic, I did not mean to rule it, that they were so; but considered it an open question, whether they were or not, which I did not wish decided one way or the other, and which I considered the Articles left open. At the same time it is quite certain, that such practices as the Invocation of Saints, cannot justly be called Catholic in the same sense in which the doctrine of the Incarnation is, or the Episcopal principle.

5. That my mode of interpreting the Articles is not of a lax and indefinite character, but one which goes upon a plain and intelligible principle, viz. that of the Catholic sense; or, in the words of the Tract, "in the most Catholic sense they will admit."

OXFORD: PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

THE

ARTICLES

TREATED ON IN TRACT 90

RECONSIDERED

AND THEIR INTERPRETATION

VINDICATED

IN A LETTER

TO THE

REV. R. W. JELF, D.D.

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

WITH AN APPENDIX FROM ABP. USSHER ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ANCIENT AND MODERN ADDRESSES TO SAINTS.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

SECOND EDITION.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER;

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1841.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Introduction	1
The Catholic Interpretation of the Articles the true one	6
Art. v. and xx. Holy Scripture and the Authority of the Church	12
Art. xix. The Visible Church . . .	19
Art. xxi. General Councils distinct from Œcumenical	23
Art. xxv. Number of the Sacraments . .	33
Art. xxviii. Transubstantiation . . .	42
Art. xxxi. Sacrifices of Masses . . .	59
Art. xxii. Introductory Remarks . . .	70
Romish doctrine of Purgatory . .	79
———————of Pardons . .	90
———————of Invocation of Saints .	104
———————of veneration and worshipping of Images and Relics . .	123
Art. xxxii. Celibacy of the Clergy . . .	129
Art. xxxvii. Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome .	135
Art. xi. Justification by Faith only . .	140
Art. xii. and xiii. Works before and after Justification	141
Conclusion.	
Condemnation of the Tract precipitate .	148
Tendency of individuals to Romanism .	154
Condition and prospects of our Church and our duties in her . . .	174
Appendix.	
Abp. Ussher on the difference between ancient addresses and modern invocations of Saints	187
Illustrations of Romish doctrine of invocation still existing, from Liguori's Glories of Mary	204

My Dear Friend,

The deep interest which you have ever taken in all which concerns the well-being of our Church, both when serving her, away from your home, in aiding to form (under God) a valuable character which may be, by His blessing, of importance to thousands, and more recently, since you have been restored to us, leaves me no doubt that you will gladly allow yourself again to be addressed on the subject, out of which so much agitation has recently been raised. And this the rather, since, although you have uniformly from the first held "that form of doctrine which was delivered" to us, and wherein your mind was moulded, you have, by your absence, been detached from the efforts of those who have been of late endeavouring to restore it to others, and so also, from the imperfections, infirmities, or errors, which may have clung to any of us in the execution of our task. Agreeing with us as to our general principles on the authority of the Church, the value of "Catholic consent" as a guide to the meaning of Holy Scripture, the high dignity of the Sacraments, the necessity of a higher

standard of holiness, self-denial, self-discipline, almsgiving, than has of late been common among us, you are not committed to any thing which we have said on these subjects in detail. You are come among us, I hope, to assist, under God's guidance,—separately, yet one in heart and object, —in the restoration of a higher sense of our privileges and duties as members and Ministers of the Apostolic Church of this land.

Nor would I, by any thing I write, seek to identify you with myself; enough that we are bound by the privileges of our common duty, and the friendship of most of our lives hitherto.

Nor, again, do I wish to enter into a vindication of the Tract, which has been the centre of this excitement. That, I am convinced, is best left in the hands of its writer; nor do I wish to make him, who views things far more deeply than I can, responsible for my construction of its details. I wish only to help to relieve, if I may, the perplexity of some minds, who think principles which they hold, involved in the censure passed upon the Tract, as also the anxieties of another class, who fear lest the adoption of the principles therein inculcated, should lead to a relaxation of the mode in which the Articles are subscribed. As an instance of this perplexity, I may mention, that calm and conscientious persons have been seriously perplexed, whether they could retain their offices, as Tutors, after the sentence of condemnation passed

on the Tract by the Heads of Houses. In this place, where the advice of elders can easily be had, such could readily be reassured, that the sense in which they understood the Tract, and consequently the way in which they subscribed and explained the Articles, was not that which the Heads of Houses meant to condemn. The perplexity however would be much more extensive and embarrassing, if any of our Bishops should hereafter advert to the Tract, and, without explaining their own views, seem to countenance the general condemnation by the Heads; among those, who coincide with the real views of the Tract, are many by whom the slightest word of their Bishop would be deeply felt; and who yet would find a difficulty in explaining themselves to him; circumstances, to which I need not here advert, have added to the distance at which a Presbyter must naturally feel himself removed from his Bishop; such persons would naturally too shrink from wearying their already overburthened Bishop with explanations, which would necessarily require much detail, and exhibition of their own personal feelings and views. "Why speakest thou any more of thy matters?" would be the feeling of such persons. And thus they would seem left to decide, as they best might, whether they could continue to serve in a Diocese in which their views of the Articles, on subscribing which they had been admitted to their cure, seemed to have been censured, whether it might not give scandal, even if otherwise allow-

able, whether they ought not silently to withdraw, and yet whether such withdrawing would not be a tacit admission, that the sense in which they had hitherto signed the Articles was an "evasion." On these and other grounds, valuable persons, whose labours our Church could ill spare, might be much harassed, if a Bishop should, by any unexplained reference to the censure of the Heads, seem to lay down that the Articles could not be conscientiously signed on the principles of the Tract, whereas such would, in fact, sign them or adhere to them, not on the principles objected to, but on such, as would be recognized by their Bishops themselves. On the other hand, I have had reason to know, that one chief fear of those who have blamed the Tract, has been lest it should introduce lax ways of signing the Articles generally, or sanction their being signed by persons, who had parted even with the most essential truths which they embody.

On these grounds, I examined (as I was able) the Tract itself, with the view to ascertain what was the amount of the relaxation of the Articles involved in it. It is the result of that examination with which I am now going to trouble you.

Some of the causes, which may have led to misapprehension, the Author of the Tract has, with that simplicity and candour which we so well know, mentioned to yourself in his Letter to you, and its Postscript. But what I wish to draw

attention to is something distinct. The Author had, apparently, two objects in view; one, to vindicate the Catholic interpretation of the Articles against a modern popular system of interpreting them, and to shew that our Articles, fairly construed, were in no case opposed to any teaching of the Church Catholic; secondly, to shew, that certain opinions or practices, which, *though not Catholic*, are to be found more or less prevalent in the early centuries, may yet be held as private opinions by individuals, without hindering any from signing the Articles with a safe conscience. In few words, that *our Articles neither contradict any thing Catholic, nor are meant to condemn any thing in early Christianity, even though not Catholic, but only the later definite system in the Church of Rome.* Perhaps these two points would be better elicited without reference to the Tridentine decrees, since this part of the question relates rather to the hope of the future repentance and restoration of Rome, than to any thing which concerns ourselves at this moment.

Now it appears to me, 1st, that the proposed interpretation of the Articles relates almost entirely to the first of these two points, on which no question would be raised, at least by none, except those of extreme views; 2dly, that there is so broad a line between any practices or doctrines occurring any where in earlier Christianity, and any later corruptions in the Church of Rome, that

there is no grounds whatever to think that the framers of the Articles, in condemning the latter, had any view to the former. I cannot then but think, that apart from the construction which has been put upon expressions in the Tract, its main, real, principles will be acknowledged, at once or gradually, to be true.

The point which I have put second, is necessarily matter of detail. The first, as I have stated it, (and it alone is of essential moment,) was, I conceive, never objected to, although it would seem to be included in the general condemnation of "the modes of interpretation suggested by the Tract."

For it would be generally admitted, except by those trained in a modern school, that any particular Church owes obedience to the Universal Church, of which it is a part; that what can be proved to have been universally received in the primitive ages, is more likely to be true than any view promulgated by individuals in modern times; that what in times near to the Apostles was universally received by the Church, is more likely to be Apostolic, than any system formed now. For myself, you are aware, I hold much more than this, and, with the current of our great Divines, believe that what in early ages can be proved, according to the rule of Vincentius, to have been held "every where, at all times, and by all," is, if matter of doctrine, binding still. But

at the least, such a principle would not be condemned by those who hold the chairs of Laud, Jackson, and Fell, or in the University of Hooker, Sanderson, Hammond, and Bull. Considering the reverence which our Church has ever paid to Christian Antiquity, the mode in which our Homilies join its teaching with that of Holy Scripture itself[a], and in which the Convocation, which inforced subscription to the Articles, refers us to it, as our guide to the doctrine of those Scriptures[b]; considering, again, the reception of the four or six first General Councils, the directions obtained by our Bishops for the studies of this very University[c], the tone which has prevailed among

[a] e. g. "contrary to the most manifest doctrine of the Scriptures, and contrary to the usage of the Primitive Church, which was most pure and uncorrupt, and contrary to the sentences of the most ancient, learned, and godly doctors of the Church." Quoted Tract 90, p. 70. n. 10. "being warned by God's holy word, and by the writings of the old godly doctors and ecclesiastical historians." ib. no. 22. add nos. 23. 27. 43. 45. 50. 51.

[b] "They [preachers] shall in the first place be careful never to teach any thing from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and collected out of that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops." Canons of 1571.

[c] "Let young Students of Theology be directed to study such books as be most agreeable in doctrine and discipline to the Church of England; and incited to bestow their times in the Fathers, the Councils, Schoolmen, Histories, and Controversies; and not to insist too long on compendiums and abbreviatures, making them the grounds of their study in Divinity."

"7th Direction which the most wise King James, (A.D.

her great Divines, it is little to say that her present Heads could not have meant to have prescribed to the Tutors of their respective Colleges to expound the Articles according to the private interpretations of modern schools, or the supposed opinions of the framers, in contradistinction to the teaching of Catholic Antiquity.

But yet further, the framers of our Articles themselves had no such wish. Our Reformers did not wish that we should be Cranmerites or Ridleyans; they did not wish to stamp their own image and superscription upon our portion of God's Church; whatever imperfections they may as men have been subject to, they wished only to clear the fine gold from any tarnish which had come over it; we have remained since the Reformation, as before, a branch of the Church Catholic; we were placed on no new platform; our Reformers did not, like Luther, form for us any new system of doctrine, such as that which bears his name; they ever appealed to Catholic Antiquity; submitted their own judgment to hers. "To depart," says Bishop Ridley, "from that the sentences of the old ancient writers do more allow, without any warrant of God's word, I cannot think it any Godly wisdom." And even Cranmer, at a very solemn

1617.) *by the advice of the Bishops*, addressed to the University of Oxford, the Vice-Chancellor, the Governors of Colleges and Halls, the two Professors, to be by them diligently observed." *Bp. Bull, Apologia pro Harmonia, S.* 1. §. 4.

moment [c], professed his readiness "in all things to follow the judgment of the most sacred word of God and of the holy Catholic Church." And confessed,

> "In all my doctrine and preaching both of the Sacraments, and of other my doctrine, whatsoever it be, not only I mean and judge, as the Catholic Church and the most holy Fathers of old meant and judged, but also, I would gladly use the same words that they used and not any other words; but to set my hand to all and singular their speeches, phrases, ways, and forms of speech, which they do use in their treatises upon the Sacraments, and to keep still their interpretation."

It were, also, manifestly, a grievous yoke, and such as it has not been ever attempted formally to lay upon us, so to tie us down to the opinions of (to use a favourite expression of a modern school) "fallible men," that we should be compelled to search up and down the works of the Reformers in order to expound the Articles according to their insight into Divine truth, and to take, as authoritative, all which, in the perplexity of controversy, may have dropped from them. The difficulty of ascertaining the meaning of Catholic Antiquity is sometimes urged by the opponents of its authority as an argument against its use; yet its language in matters of faith is clear and definite; but what a task were it to turn us adrift in writings, whose authors on some points

[c] Appeal at his degradation, Works, vol. iv. p. 126, 7.

confessedly changed their views; who had a difficulty in fixing their language, lest while avoiding prevalent errors, they should unsettle kindred truth; who were embarrassed by all that perplexity, which any change of rooted opinions, for the time, almost of necessity, involves; who were surrounded by opposing errors; were, in some degree, joined in one common cause of removing abuses with men, like the Swiss Reformers, themselves involved in grievous error, and so must and did sympathize with them, and wished to mould them with themselves in one Reformed Church [d]. If it be thought difficult in Christian Antiquity to separate what is Catholic from what may be peculiar to the mind of the writer, what a task were it to take the works of such a period as this, for the rule of our theological teaching!

Again, (as has been often stated,) we have not our Articles from their framers; the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI. were never accepted by the Church at large [e]; though mainly the same, they were still modified, when formed into the Thirty-nine; primitive and essential words of our Liturgy were then restored; our Services were then, in expression certainly, restored to a more primitive mould than under the Reformers; why then is our Church to be bound to go back to the Re-

[d] See Tract 81, p. 27. note on the origin of the Forty-two Articles.

[e] Strype's Cranmer, ii. 27, 34. Heylyn, p. 121.

formers, for the exposition of Articles, which in their present forms he did not receive from them, and whose work in other respects she reformed upon the primitive model?

The last Convocation from which we received them, was at a period (1662) when the deference owed to Catholic Antiquity, which the Reformers felt, was most fully developed and understood.

One needed not to have used many words on this subject but for a recent tendency to set up the Reformers—not as instruments only of God's good Providence in removing error, but—as the founders of a system of faith, and the authorized expositors of our belief. This is the real point at issue, of which there were other indications before this controversy arose. Men must lean upon some authority; they cannot guide themselves; they who think they derive their faith immediately and exclusively from Holy Scripture, for the most part follow human guidance more rigidly than others; the only real question is, from whom, under God's guidance, we shall learn the meaning of those Scriptures, from ancients or from moderns.

Whatever then individuals may practise for themselves, it will not, I conceive, be generally objected to any of us, as a grave error, that we hold that the Articles are to be interpreted according to the teaching of the Church Catholic. Let me then request you, as briefly as may be, to go through with me the several Articles relating to the points

in controversy between us and the Romanists, and so see whether the main objects of the Tract be not what I have said. If, even on points of doctrine or practice not-Catholic, there be a distinct line between what is early and what is Romanist, it will, of course, be no relaxation of the Articles to maintain, that when they speak of what is "Romish," they do not contemplate any thing in early Christianity; on the other hand, in what forms, as we shall see, the main object of the Tract—to shew on points, where there is a Catholic doctrine, that our Articles are in harmony with the teaching of the Church Catholic;—this view, so far from relaxing the meaning of the Articles, gives them greater stringency, and lays us under a deeper obligation; since now we are bound to receive them not only on the authority of our immediate mother, but of her, "the Jerusalem from above, who is the" common "mother of us all."

Articles vi. and xx.

"*Holy Scripture and the Authority of the Church.*

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. . . . . .The Church hath power to decree (statuendi) rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain (instituere) any thing that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it so expound

one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree (decernere) any thing against the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce (obtrudere) any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation."

With regard to these two Articles, little has been done except to combine their teaching; an Ultra-Protestant sense can only be given to the sixth Article by detaching it from the twentieth. Alone, it only *declares*, what is the *source* of the articles of faith, Holy Scripture; how those articles are to be derived from that source, is *implied* only; it stands over against the Romanist system, which requires things to be believed as articles of faith, which are "not read in Holy Scripture nor can be proved by it:" who is so to prove it, who has the power of "requiring" what can be so proved, to be believed as an Article of the Faith, is reserved for the twentieth. Only, (as observed elsewhere,) in speaking of "requiring," it *implies* that some one has the right to require; and that right the twentieth declares to be vested in the Church; "the Church has authority in controversies of faith." The same Article implies that the Church has a right to "expound Scripture" and "enforce things to be believed, which can be proved thereby;" for it were idle to say that "it is not lawful for the Church *so* to expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another," unless, within these

limits she were its lawful expositor; or to say that "besides Holy Writ, she ought not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation," unless out of Holy Writ she might so enforce them. And this power of the Church we ourselves practically acknowledge whenever we repeat the Athanasian Creed.

This the Tract sums up thus:

"First, the Church *expounds and enforces the faith*; for it is forbidden to expound in a particular way, or so to enforce as to obtrude; next, that it derives the faith *wholly from Scripture;* third, that its office is to educe an harmonious interpretation of Scripture."

Indeed, the Tract, so far from pressing, as I think it might, that in points of faith, or things necessary to salvation, "private judgment" is excluded, contents itself with saying that it is at least an open question; "nothing is said [in the Article] of the *private judgment of the individual* being the ultimate standard of interpretation:" nor on the other does it assert any thing as to catholic tradition being the Church's guide in interpreting Holy Scripture, but only negatively that "not a word is said in favour of Scripture having no rule or method to fix interpretation by, or, as is commonly expressed, *being the sole rule of faith.*" So that, so far from drawing the Article to any extreme view, our friend only shews that it does not contain any thing contradicting the authority of the Church and tradition, leaving others free possession of

their opinion, provided that they ascribe not to the Article un-Catholic statements, to which it is rather opposed. At the same time, he maintains fully against the Romish error, that the faith is derived "*wholly from Scripture*," discarding only the term "sole rule of faith" as ambiguous. For where Scripture is by moderns termed "the sole rule of faith," it is used in the sense of the sole "source of faith," or the sole "ultimate standard of faith," as opposed to any other independent documents of the Faith; where the title "rule of faith" is given to the Creeds, it means the rule whereby the soundness of the faith of individuals or Churches may be tested. Scripture is the rule of the Creeds; the Creeds, of the faith of individuals or particular Churches.

Since, however, any mention of tradition is thought to favour errors in the Church of Rome, (often as it has been shewn that those errors do not rest upon Tradition but are opposed to it,) it may be well to set down some words of Thorndike[f], shewing that any reliance upon it is in fact opposed to the doctrine of infallibility, as on the other hand any appeal to human authorities is to that of Scripture being the sole guide to the faith.

"Always it is easy for me to demonstrate that this resolution, 'That the Scripture, holding the meaning of it by the tradition of the Church, is the only means to decide controversies of Faith,' is nearer to the common terms, that the Scripture is the only rule of faith, than to that infallibility which is pretended for the Church

[f] Epilogue i. 32. p. 196.

of Rome; having demonstrated, that, to depend upon the infallibility of the present, and the tradition of the Catholic Church, are things inconsistent, whereas this cannot be inconsistent with that Scripture, which is no less delivered from age to age than tradition is, though the one by writing, the other by word of mouth, and serving chiefly to determine the true meaning of it, when it comes in debate."

And a little before;

"For as I have argued, that those who maintain the infallibility of the present Church, do contradict themselves, whensoever they have recourse either to the Scripture or to any words of the Church, to evidence the sense of the Scripture in that, which otherwise they profess the authority of the Church alone infallibly to determine: so, those who will have the Scripture alone to determine all controversies of faith, and yet take the pains to bring evidence of the meaning thereof, from that which had been received in the Church, may very well be said to contradict themselves."

With the same moderation is the subject of the "Apocrypha" touched upon; and as the Author has since stated, it has been one source of the imputation of vagueness cast upon the Tract, that he did not wish to press his own conclusions, but only negatively to secure a fair liberty for those for whom he wrote, against un-Catholic interpretations, which a popular system would identify with the Articles.

It is needless to say to you how deeply some persons, mostly but little acquainted with the Apocrypha, condemn it, how they offend foreign

Churches by translating and circulating the Bible without it, how they would gladly displace it from the order of our Lessons, how they have in fact succeeded in removing it from the Bible in ordinary circulation among us. In opposition to this, the Tract states, p. 6.

"that the books which are commonly called Apocrypha, are not asserted in this Article to be destitute of inspiration or to be simply human, but to be not canonical; in other words, to differ from Canonical Scripture, specially in this respect, viz. that they are not adducible in proof of doctrine. 'The other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, and yet doth not apply them to establish any doctrine.'"

It might have said much more; and our Church, in this as in other instances, by taking up the position of the early Church, takes away the vantage-ground of Romish Controversialists. For these, in opposition to such as deny the Apocrypha any value, or look upon it as a mere human book, can easily appeal to its being read in Churches together with the Canonical Scriptures, or to passages of the fathers, in which they cite from it, under the title of "Scripture, Divine Scripture," and the like. The subject is far too wide to adduce the proof thus incidentally; yet I may mention as the result of a long and careful investigation, that I found full evidence that no other Canon of the Old Testament as possessing *plenary* Inspiration, was

ever received in any Church, than that of the Hebrew Scriptures; and yet, that the same fathers, who were fully aware of this, did, in every Church, without scruple, cite the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, as being in a sense inspired beyond the writings of any men after the Apostolic age. They do indeed use the word "Inspiration" in a wide sense, from the plenary and infallible inspiration of Holy Scripture, down to the "holy inspiration whereby we think those things that be good;" they pray that in searching out the meaning of Holy Scripture, God would "inspire" them with the same Spirit, whereby that Scripture was written; but they do not use the terms "Scripture," &c. of any other books not in the primary Canon, except the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. One or two add some of the writings of the corresponding period in the New Testament, the Apostolic age, but the designation of the Apocrypha as Scripture is universal. And herein their practice remarkably corresponds with that of our own Church; the mode in which our Homilies cite the Apocrypha is in exact accordance with, and illustrates the language of the Ancient Church; both knew that they were not, in the same sense, Scripture, as the authoritative Hebrew Canon; yet, as by both they were publicly read in their worship, so both cite them at times indiscriminately with the higher Scriptures, and under the same titles; believing apparently that, even after the Spirit of prophecy

was suspended in its fulness and authoritativeness, during the intervening period before It again descended in Its fulness on our Lord, It still continued to guide the thoughts of some in a more authoritative way than was permitted to any after our Lord came, not as an independent revelation, but commenting on, developing, and applying, the meaning of the earlier, until the Sun of righteousness arose.

Article xix.

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men (cœtus fidelium), in the which the pure word of God is preached and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite for the same.

This Article seems to have been treated of, rather for completeness and for truth's sake, than for any immediate subject of controversy. For few would not now shrink from holding that all the Churches under the obedience and in the Communion of Rome were not in such sense true Churches, as to be a portion of the one Visible Church. Words nearly corresponding in the Confession of Augsburg are indeed in their "Apology for the Confession" so interpreted as to seem to deny to the Roman Churches the title of a Church; for, while admitting that a society which holds the foundation, remains a Church, although it build

thereon hay, straw, stubble, it goes on to say[g], "Most of those things which our adversaries mention *overthrow the faith*, as that they condemn the article of remission of sins, in which we say that remission of sins is received by faith." Such, however, (though the like sentiments may have been and are still held by some in our Church,) is not the current opinion of the Divines of our Church; nor though our reformers borrowed, with some modifications, the language of the Confession of Augsburg, can we be any way tied to Lutheran expositions of it, which would be to acknowledge them as authoritative documents in our Church.

With regard then to the Church of Rome, to take such as rather lean to the opposite side, Bp. Hall[h] adopts the

"charitable profession of the zealous Luther, 'We profess that under the Papacy there is much Christian good, yea, all, &c. I say, moreover, that under the Papacy is true Christianity, yea the very kernel of Christianity, &c.' and that, on the very ground, that it held the fundamental truth in the Creeds, 'Neither do we censure that Church for what it hath not, but for what it hath; fundamental truth is like that Maronean wine, which if it be mixed with twenty times so much water, holds its strength; the sepulchre of Christ was overwhelmed by the Pagans with earth and rubbish,—yet still, there was the sepulchre of Christ; and it is a ruled case of Papinian, that a sacred place loseth not the holiness with the demolished walls; no more doth the Roman lose

[g] Apol. p. 117. ed. Tittm.

[h] The Old Religion, c. 1.

the claim of a true visible Church by her manifold and deplorable corruptions; her unsoundness is not less apparent than her being; if she were once the spouse of Christ and her adulteries are known, yet the divorce is not sued out."

And Bp. Davenant[i], almost commenting on the notes of a Church mentioned in the Article, alleges both sufficiently to exist in the Romish Church;

"For the being of a Church does principally stand upon the gracious action of God, calling men out of darkness and death, unto the participation of light and life in Christ Jesus. So long as God continues this calling unto any people, though they (as much as in them lies) darken this light, and corrupt the means which should bring them to life and salvation in Christ; yet where God calls men unto the participation of life in Christ, by the word and by the Sacraments, there is the true being of a Christian Church, let men be never so false in their expositions of God's word, or never so untrusty in mingling their own traditions with God's ordinances. Thus the Church of the Jews lost not her being of a Church when she became an idolatrous Church. And thus under the government of the Scribes and Pharisees, who voided the commandments of God by their own traditions, there was yet standing a true Church, in which Zacharias, Elizabeth, the Virgin Mary, and our Saviour Himself was born, who were members of that Church, and yet participated not in the corruptions thereof. Thus to grant that the Roman was and is a true visible Church, (though in doctrine a false, and in practice an idolatrous Church,) is a true assertion, and of greater use and necessity in our controversy with Papists about the perpetuity of the Christian Church, than is understood by those that gainsay it."

[i] Letter to Bp. Hall appended to the Old Religion, t. ii. p. 77.

Amid this strong language as to the actual state of the Romish Church, Bp. Davenant holds that to be a "true Church," in which men may be saved, the "pure word of God" being, as Bp. Hall says, those "fundamentals of the faith," the doctrines of the Creed, into which we are baptized. It is indeed to be feared that the Romish Communion, as a whole, has, in the loss of the Cup, sustained a grievous privation; but they who against the Churches in the Communion of Rome would on this ground press the words "duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same," should shew how (sad as the loss is) it is more essential, than the absence of consecration by a Minister, who through the Apostles has derived his commission from Christ.

The latter part of the Article (the omission of which has been animadverted on) states only, what all in our Church lament, that "the Church of Rome has erred in matters of faith" also; it does not affirm it to have erred in such articles of faith as endanger salvation. Nor, again, has it appeared clear that our Article means more than to affirm that the Church of Rome, having erred, is consequently not infallible. It says not, in the present, "errs in matters of faith," but speaks in the past, "hath erred," just in the same way as it says of "the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch," that they "have erred," which was in time past.

A recent writer[k] says on this Article,

"The Article only affirms that the Roman Church has erred in matters of faith, e. g. in the case of Liberius and Honorius; there is no assertion, that it does now err in faith. The object is to deny the infallibility of the particular Church of Rome."

At all events, it should ever be borne in mind, that the Church of Rome has, amid her corruptions, continued to be a faithful witness to the saving truths as to the Blessed Trinity, which were denied by the heretics of the early centuries, and which our Church, by retaining the Apostles' Creed as her summary of faith in her Baptismal Service and the Visitation of the Sick, acknowledges to be the substance of saving Faith.

Article xxi.

"General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, in things pertaining to God."

This being the only remaining Article on the Church considered in the Tract, we may as well take it now, although it relates only to a "private opinion" which the Author wishes to be regarded as admissible. It is, that there are certain Coun-

[k] Palmer on the Church, p. i. c. xi. §. 8. t. i. p. 316.

cils, viz. Œcumenical, which are not liable to err, and that the Article meant to take the term "General" in a popular sense, not denoting Councils strictly Œcumenical, but, as it is commonly used, Councils composed of Bishops from different Provinces, as opposed to "Provincial" or "National." And this last is plainly the meaning of the Article; for in that it says, not only that "General Councils *may* err," but that they "sometimes have erred," it does not mean to include Œcumenical Councils, since our Church receives the six Œcumenical Councils[l], and our best Divines speak of there having been six[m] or four[n] Œcumenical Councils *only*, according as they include the fifth and sixth in the third or fourth to which they were supplementary, or no.

[l] See Authorities, "Letter to the Bp. of Oxford," p. 44.

[m] The Homilies speak of "those[1] six Councils, which were allowed and received by all men," and of the last of the "four first General Councils[2]" as giving instruction even for matter of practice.

[n] Hooker, v. liv. 10. ed. Keb. Hammond on Heresie, sect. vii. and ix. expressly including the fifth and sixth. (In sect. 15. he says, "the first four or, if you will, six, or indeed any of the Œcumenical Councils truly so called.") Bp. Andrews defends K. James naming four (ad Card. Bell. resp. c. i. p. 20. c. vii. p. 160, l.) in the latter place he accepts the sixth when it agrees with the four first, [i. e. excluding the spurious Acta,] but thinks the fifth and sixth *may* have been inferior.

[1] Against Peril of Idolatry, Part II. p. 190. ed. Oxf. 1822.

[2] On Fasting, Part I. p. 262.

Thus Field[o]:

"Concerning the General Councils of this sort, that hitherto have been holden, we confess that in respect of the matter about which they were called, so nearly and essentially concerning the life and soul of the Christian Faith, and in respect of the manner and form of their proceeding, and the evidence of proof brought in them, they are, and ever were, expressly to be believed by all such as perfectly understand the meaning of their determination. And that therefore it is not to be marvelled at, if Gregory profess, that he 'honoureth the first four Councils as the four Gospels;' and that whosoever believeth them not, though he seem to be 'a stone elect and precious,' yet he lieth beside the foundation and out of the building. Of this sort there are only six; the first defining the Son of God to be co-essential, co-eternal, and co-equal with the Father. The second defining that the Holy Ghost is truly God, co-essential, co-eternal, and co-equal with the Father and the Son. The third, the Unity of Christ's Person. The fourth, the distinction and diversity of His Natures, in and after the Personal Union. The fifth, condemning some remains of Nestorianism; more fully explaining things stumbled at in the Council of Chalcedon, and accusing the heresy of Origen and his followers touching the temporal punishments of Devils and wicked cast-aways; and the sixth, defining and clearing the distinction of Operations, Actions, Powers, and Wills in Christ according to the diversity of His Natures. These were all the lawful General Councils (lawful I say both in their beginning, and proceeding, and continuance) that were ever holden in the Christian Church, touching matters of faith."

Œcumenical Councils then are very limited in number, and different in kind from mere General

[o] Of the Church, v. 51.

Councils; they are Councils of the whole Church, *which have been subsequently received by the whole Church;* and of these there are but six; the seventh General Council which is received by the Greeks, (the Deutero-Nicene Council,) was formally rejected at the time in the Western Church[p]; the several General Councils received by the Churches of the Roman obedience, are not received by the Greek Church, or by ourselves. Romanist theologians, on the contrary, as Bellarmine (whose definition of a General Council is "one[q], in which the Bishops of the whole Church may and ought to be present, unless they be lawfully hindered, and in which no one rightly presides except the Pope or one in his name," and who holds it to be "matter of faith that General Councils, confirmed by the Pope, cannot err either in faith or morals[r],") count, in

[p] The second Council of Nice was not at first recognized universally even in those Churches in which it was received, the Eastern and Rome. Only six General Councils are spoken of in the East, nearly 600 years after; (A. D. 1339,) by Pope Nicolas, a century after it, (A. D. 859,) and by Pope Adrian. (A. D. 871.) It was rejected by 300 Bishops of Gaul, Aquitain, Germany, and Italy, at the Council of Frankfort, (A. D. 794.) and called "a pseudo-synod" by Gallican and German writers from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries. Its degree of reception was owing to its being interpolated in the Liber Diurnus by Gratian, and then inserted in the Canon law; but the Council of Frankfort which rejected it, was never rescinded. See further, and authorities, in Palmer on the Church, p. iv. c. 10. sect. iv. add Perceval on the Roman Schism, p. 73 sqq.

[q] De Conc. i. 4.

[r] Ib. ii. 1.

all, eighteen such; "other Romanist theologians contend for nine or ten, others for various larger numbers; those who follow Bossuet agree in principle with ourselves, that the subsequent acceptance of a General Council by the universal Church alone makes it Œcumenical[s]."

Thus then there is ample scope for our Article in asserting, that "General Councils may err, and sometimes have erred," without touching upon Œcumenical[t]. The framers of our Articles were not here concerned with abstract propositions, but with matters of fact; it was not their object to settle whether there were or were not certain Councils, which God might hereafter protect from error, as He had hitherto;—such, namely, as have been received by the Church universal—but, both in defence and warning, to maintain that "General Councils" had in themselves no binding authority, nor were infallible. Were they so, our Church would of course be in error, in that she has pronounced contrary to Councils which the Roman Church counts general; the Article was also a pro-

[s] Palmer on the Church, iv. 7.

[t] "The Article speaketh of General Councils indefinitely, without precisely determining which are General, which not, what is a General Council, what not; and so may and doth include reputed or pretended General Councils, univocè general, though not exactly and truly indeed, (such as was the Council of Ariminum,) whereof I did not so much as intend to speak, my speech being limited with true and lawful, of which sort are not many to be found." Bp. Montague, Appeal, p. 125.

test beforehand against any thing which might be enacted against the truth she maintained, by any Council such as could then be brought together, and claiming to itself the title of "General," as did the Council of Trent: it remains a valuable warning to all Councils beforehand, before God has set His seal upon them. As in the case of individuals, so it may be with the Church. We know that there are individuals, who will finally persevere; but who they are is not known even by themselves, unless God specially reveal it to them; and this knowledge when He vouchsafes, He has probably always given, as to Daniel and St. Paul, towards the close of life. Earlier, He gives hopes, earnests, dim intimations, to His faithful ones, and to most, probably, according to their faithfulness; but it seems from His dealings, as though the certain assurance that any one would be saved, were too much for an individual during "the burthen and heat of the day." In like way, it might be injurious for any number of individuals, such even as a General Council, to know beforehand that they would be infallibly guided into truth; it might lead to presumption, might weaken that sense of dependence, humility, the diligent preparation and watchfulness, and the earnestness of the prayers, upon which their inerrancy depends; and yet as there are some such Councils which God has preserved from error, so there may be a certain class, which it has been ever His purpose, secret to

themselves, so to preserve; and we may hope that should He allow any Council hereafter, like the six Œcumenical, to receive the sanction of the Universal Church, He will preserve this also from error. Certainly, this case is not liable to the risk of presumption which attends the theory of infallibility prevalent in the Romish Church, since, whether the Council is Œcumenical or no, is known by the event, depending upon its *subsequent* reception by the universal Church[u]. And again, since our Lord's promise is to the whole Church, but no General Council hitherto has, or probably could, in itself[x], at the time of its assembling, fully represent the Universal Church, but would probably consist of the *minority* of her Bishops, who might be misled, and might be disowned by the

[u] Hammond on Heresy, sect. xiv. rests the "inerrableness of General Councils," chiefly on their "finding approbation and reception among all those Bishops and Doctors of the Church diffused, which were out of the Council," since this makes it the act of the whole Church. In this the more moderate Theologians in the Romish Communion agree with him. (Palmer on the Church, p. iv. c. 7. p. 151.)

[x] Hammond, ib. sect. vi. §. 7. 8. 15. "For that any Council of Bishops, the most numerous that ever was in the world, (much less a but major part of those few, that be there present,) is not yet really the Universality of Christians, is too evident to be doubted of. It can only then be pretended, that it is the Universal Representative, or such an assembly, wherein is contained the virtues and influences of the whole Universal Church. And thus indeed I suppose it to be, as often as the doctrines there established by universal consent (founded in Scripture and tradition), have either been before discussed and resolved in each provincial Council, which have sent their delegates thither from

Churches which they professed to represent, it would follow that no General Council could claim to itself the guiding Presence of its Lord, with the same confidence as we may trust that it is pledged to the Church Universal. Certainly, there would be something so shocking in the thought that the whole Church should accept an erroneous decision in a matter of the Faith, that one should think it would be a relief to any one, not to think himself obliged to aver, (as a thing certainly determined,) that Councils, in such sort Œcumenical, "may err." But, in truth, I feel convinced that, as such Councils were not in the minds of the framers of the Articles, so neither were they contemplated by such as objected to the interpretation given, and that this objection will be readily dismissed. Hammond certainly sets it down, without offence, as a pious opinion, that Œcumenical Councils would not err[z].

all the parts of the world, or else have Post-factum, after the promulgation, *been accepted by them* and acknowledged to agree with that faith which they had originally received. When a doctrine is conciliarly agreed on, it is then promulgated to all, and the Universal, though but tacit, approbation and reception thereof, the no considerable contradiction given to it in the Church, is a competent evidence, that this is the judgment and concordant tradition of the whole Church, though no such resolution of provincial Synods have preceded."

[z] Of Heresie, sect. ix. "Of such [Councils truly General] none yet ever erred, that ever I yet read or observed, in points fundamental, and therefore I saw and see no cause but a man may say, such a Council shall never err in fundamentals." Bp. Montague, Appeal, p. 123. add, more at length, sect. 14.

" Though I make it no matter of faith, because delivered neither by Scripture nor Apostolical tradition, yet I shall number it among the 'Piè credibilia,' that no General Council, truly such, 1. duly assembled, 2. freely celebrated, and 3. universally received, either hath erred, or ever shall err, in matters of faith."

I may add in illustration, that some of our own Divines[a] instance the Council of Ariminum as a General Council which erred, although in the end confirmed by the Pope Liberius, but not universally received. And herein some of the Divines in the Romish Communion agree.

" Thus[b] Waldensis expressly affirmeth, that 'General Councils have erred and may err, and confidently delivereth, that it is no particular Church that hath assurance of holding the truth and not erring from the faith, neither that of Africa, which Donatus so much admired, nor the particular Church of Rome, but the Universal Church; nor that Universal Church which is gathered together in a General Council, which we have found to have erred sometimes, (as that at Ariminum under Taurus the Governor, and that at Constantinople under Justinian the younger in the time of Sergius the Pope, according to Bede and certain others,) but that Catholic Church of Christ, which hath been dispersed throughout the whole world, by the ministry of the Apostles, and others their successors, ever since the Baptism of Christ, and continued unto these times, which undoubtedly keepeth the true faith and the faithful testimony of Christ, teaching babes heavenly wisdom, and retaining the truth constantly in the midst of all extremities of errors.' "

[a] e. g. Field, v. 51. p. 664.

[b] Field, l. c. p. 663. see other opinions, ibid.

And in this, it should be observed, that there is a drawing near of Divines in the Romish Communion to the principles of our Church, not of ours to theirs; and on the ground which these take in common with ourselves, they might, if God hereafter should give them repentance, rescind the Council of Trent, as not being a Council truly General or Œcumenical, being neither free, nor adequately representing the whole Church, (but being rather an Italian Council,) nor having been subsequently received by the Church Catholic. But they approach to us, by abandoning what is Romish, and adhering to what is Catholic in their Church, and we maintain what is Catholic and approach not to what is Romish. For it is not the holding Œcumenical Councils not to have erred, or trusting assuredly that they never will err, which approximates to Romanism, but holding that General Councils (be the Bishops present exceeding few, as the non-Italian Bishops at the Council of Trent) are Œcumenical and authoritative, if confirmed by the Pope. Rather the Romanists, in so far as they are such, disparage even Œcumenical Councils, in order to make room for the authority of the Pope. As Field says [c],

"And therefore howsoever we dare not pronounce that lawful General Councils are far from danger of erring, (as some among our adversaries do,) yet do we more honour and esteem and more fully admit all the General Councils,

[c] l. c. 31. 51. fin.

that ever hitherto have been holden, than they do, who fear not to charge some of the chiefest of them with error, as both the second and the fourth for equalling the Bishop of Constantinople with the Bishop of Rome, which I think they suppose to have been an error of faith."

And this then may serve as an instance how an approximation between us and certain Divines of the Romish Communion does not necessarily imply any advances on our part to Romanism, and may open a prospect (however faint and distant it may now be) how, without the sacrifice of any truth, the Church may, on the principles of our own, again, if God vouchsafe, become one.

Article xxv.

"These five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown, partly of the corrupt following (pravâ imitatione) of the Apostles, partly from states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of sacraments (sacramentorum eandem rationem) with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained by God."

On the same ground, that our Church did not contradict itself, it is plain that the exposition given of this Article in the Tract is the correct one, that

"this Article does not deny the five rites in question to be [in some sense] sacraments, but to be Sacraments in the sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are Sacraments; (Sacraments of the Gospel) sacraments with an outward sign ordained of God."

For since the Homilies call marriage a "Sacrament[h]," it follows that the Articles do not reject the five rites as being in *any* sense "Sacraments." They neither restrain "Sacramental rites" to these five, nor deny that these five may in some larger sense be Sacraments. There is also a remarkable correspondence between the Articles and the Homilies, in that both use qualifying and guarded expressions in speaking of the title of these rites to be called "Sacraments." Our Articles do not introduce words at random. It has then some meaning when our Articles say, they "are not to be counted for *Sacraments of the Gospel*," that they "have not *like* nature of Sacraments;" or the Homilies "that in the *exact signification of a Sacrament* there be but two," or that "Absolution is *no such Sacrament* as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are," or that "neither it *nor any other Sacrament* else be *such* Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are," or that "the ancient writers in giving the name not only to these five, but also to divers other ceremonies, did not mean to repute them as Sacraments *in the same signification* as the two;" or that "S. Augustine, in the *exact meaning* of the word, makes mention expressly of two." And with this coincides the definition of our Catechism, that there are "two only, generally [i. e. universally] necessary to salvation," the others so entitled, not being of universal obligation, but relating to

[h] Sermon on Swearing, Part I.

certain conditions and circumstances of life only. Certainly persons, who denied these rites to be in any way Sacraments, (according to those larger definitions of S. Augustine, "a sacred sign[j]" or "a sign[k] applied to things of God," or of the Schoolmen[l] "a sign of a sacred thing,") would have said so at once, and not have so uniformly and guardedly said on each occasion, that they were not such, in the "*exact*" or "the *same* signification," the "*exact* meaning," "*such*," "of the *like* nature;" nor, of one which they regarded as in no sense a Sacrament, would they have said "neither it, nor any other Sacrament else."

Nor is this, as I have elsewhere[m] pointed out, any approximation to the Romish view of the seven Sacraments; since 1) (which is of most moment) the Romanists studiously confound the difference between the two great Sacraments, which derive into us the very life of our Lord, and the other rites, which may be, and some certainly are, (if faithfully received) means of grace, "but are not, (to use our friend's words[n] of the two great Sacraments) "*justifying* rites, or instruments of communicating the Atonement, which is the one thing

[j] De Civ. D. x. 33.

[k] De Doctr. Christ. iii. 6. quoted by Bp. Jewel, Answ. to Hard. p. 82.

[l] P. Lombard, l. iv. dist. 1. ib.

[m] Letter to the Bp. of Oxford, p. 106 sqq.

[n] Newman on Justification, lect. 6. v. fin.

necessary to us;" 2) our Church does not, as he also observes, "strictly determine the number."

This view of the relation of these five rites to the two great Sacraments, was clearly stated, without offence, by the sound and judicious Thorndike [o].

"That which remaineth for this place is, the consideration of the nature and number of the Sacraments, which being essentially ceremonies of God's service, the right resolution of the controversy concerning it must needs consist in distinguishing the grounds upon which, and the intents to which they are instituted; the difference whereof must make some properly Sacraments, the rest, either no Sacraments at all, or in a several sense and so to a several purpose. And truly, of all the controversies which the Reformation hath occasioned, I see not less reason for either side to stand upon their terms, than in this; which stands upon the term of a Sacrament, being not found in the Scriptures attributed either to seven or to two. For being taken up by the Church, that is to say, by those writers whom the Church alloweth and honoureth, what reason can deny the Church liberty to attribute it to any thing, which the power given the Church enableth it to appoint and to use, for the obtaining God's blessing upon Christians? Why should not any action appointed by the Church to obtain God's sanctifying grace, by virtue of any promise which the Gospel containeth, be counted a Sacrament? At least, supposing it to consist in a ceremony, fit to signify the blessing which it pretendeth to procure. For it is manifest, that Baptism also, and the Eucharist, are ceremonies signifying visibly that invisible grace, wherewith God sanctifieth Christians. But there will be therefore no

[o] Epilogue, book iii. p. 342.

consequence, that Baptism and the Eucharist should be counted Sacraments for the same reason and in the same nature and kind, for which any thing else is or can be counted a Sacrament. No, not though they may all in their proper sense be truly called Sacraments of the Church, because the dispensing of them all is trusted with the Church.—These two Sacraments have the promise of grace absolutely so called, that is, of all the grace which the Gospel promiseth; which it is to be acknowledged and maintained, that no other of those actions, that are or may be called Sacraments of the Church, doth or can do, upon the like terms as they do."

The distinction which he lays down between the two great Sacraments and the five rites is, that

"These [p] two immediately bring forth God's grace, as instruments of His promise, by His appointment; the rest must obtain it by the means of God's Church, and the blessing annexed to communion with it."

"Upon these terms," he proceeds to shew that all the other five rites may, in their right use, "very well be counted Sacraments of the Church," and thus sums up [q],

"In fine, the name and notion of a Sacrament, as it hath been duly used by the Church and writers allowed by the Church, extendeth to all holy actions, done by virtue of the office which God hath trusted His Church with in hope of obtaining the grace which He promiseth. Baptism and the Eucharist are actions appointed by God, in certain creatures, utterly impertinent to the effect of

[p] ib. p. 344. [q] ib. p. 349.

grace, setting aside His appointment; but apt to signify all the grace which the Gospel promiseth, by virtue of that correspondence which holds between things visible and sensible, and things intelligible and invisible: both, antecedent for their institution to the foundation of the Church; the society whereof subscribeth, upon condition of the first, and for communion in the second. The rest are actions appointed to be solemnized in the Church by the Apostles, not always every where precisely with the same ceremonies, but such as always may reasonably serve to signify the graces, which it prays for, on the behalf of them who receive them; the hope of that Grace being grounded upon God's general promise of hearing the prayers of His Church which the constitution thereof involveth. Nor am I solicitous to make that construction, which may satisfy the decrees of the Councils of Florence and Trent, who have first taken upon them to decree under Anathema, the conceits of the school in reducing them to the number of seven; but seeing the particulars so qualified by ancient writers in the Church, and the number agreed upon by the Greek Church as well as the Latin; I have acknowledged that sense of their sayings, which the primitive order of the Catholic Church enforceth. For though I count it a great abuse to maintain simple Christians in an opinion, that the outward works of them, not supposing the ground upon which, the intent to which, the disposition with which, they are done, secures the salvation of them to whom they are ministered, which opinion the formal ministering of them seemeth to maintain, yet is it a far greater abuse, to place the reformation of the Church in abolishing the solemnities rather than in reducing the right understanding of the ground and intent of those offices, which they serve to solemnize.

You will well know that neither in this, nor in any thing else which I may allege, do I wish to

assimilate our language to that of the Church of Rome, or even to use that of our Homilies, when they call Marriage a "Sacrament:" it would be unnatural and affected and worse; I would (since in these days one must speak of self, and may more naturally in writing to a friend) rather use the language of the fathers as to other things than to these, lest I should seem to be speaking not in a Catholic but in a Romish sense; yet one need do neither; on the contrary, since the word "Sacrament" has been misused to place the five rites on a level with the two great Sacraments, and there is no necessity for retaining it, it were wrong and cruel to risk perplexing person's minds by reviving it; the truth which our Homilies imply may also be conveyed in other ways[r]: but in truth it is not our language, but our feelings towards holy rites, which we need to have altered; and I feel assured that a more reverend estimation and a more hallowed use of these gifts of the Church, as means whereby grace is bestowed, or enlarged, or restored, so far from placing them on a level with the two high Sacraments, would the rather raise men's veneration for these, as being so far above them. Men's real objection to considering these rites as in any degree "Sacramental," arises, it is to be feared, partly in their low estimate of

[r] e. g. Mysteries, sacramentals, see Hooker, E. P. iv. 1. 2. ed. Keble. Beza calls the imposition of hands, "this as it were sacrament." Ib.

God's gifts thereby, or of the sanctity required of the confirmed, the married, the Priesthood, or of the grievous hindrance which sin interposes to the shining in of Christ's light and grace upon the soul, which Absolution tends to remove, but partly also in their inadequate thought of the two great Sacraments. When these, instead of being instruments of knitting the soul to Christ, are regarded, in the ordinary sense, as "means of grace" only, i. e. aids to spiritual improvement, there is no room for inferior sacramental actions. But if we regard these as instruments of conveying grace, and yet the two Sacraments as so removed above them, as to be instruments of a different kind, then will these the rather take the place which our Lord gave them in the Christian life, as the appointed channels for applying the Atonement to the soul, the communication of Himself and His life. On the other hand, it would tend indefinitely to raise the whole tone of our life and conversation, were we, after the manner of the fathers, to look on holy actions as having in them something sacramental, as being, although inferior to the great Sacraments, employed, in a mysterious way, to convey His grace to us, and so as being mysteries; if we habitually regarded institutions, some of which are even now accounted "means of grace," as being such, in that (whereby alone they could be such) God gives them power, which of themselves they could not have, and endows them with heavenly virtue;

if we looked on God's part in them rather than our own; if we regarded "preaching" such, because He puts His words into our mouths, and "sends His blessing, that His word spoken by our mouths, may have such success that it be not spoken in vain[s];" or, with those of old, accounted "fasting" sacramental[t], because, as our Homily[u] says, "fasting used with prayer is of great efficacy and weigheth much with God," and "obtaineth notable things at His hand;" and our Lord says, "This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting[x];" or the "Creed[y]," because its recital is not only a confession of our faith and a praise of God, but because He makes it a means of deepening in us the faith which we profess; or "prayer[z]," because it is the voice of God within us to Himself; or our "Lord's prayer," because it hath "such wealth of

[s] Prayer in Ordination of Priests.

[t] Sacramentum Esuritionis, S. Hilary, ap. Jewel Defence of the Apology, p. 215.

[u] On Fasting, Part II. p. 272.

[x] Matt. xvii. 21. quoted ib. in proof of the efficacy of fasting.

[y] "Receiving the Sacrament of the Gospel Creed, inspired by the Lord, instituted by the Apostles, of which the words are few, the mysteries great," Liturgy of Gelasius ap. Ass. cod. lit. i. 11. so also the old Gothic and Gallican (ib. 30.) speaks of "the Sacrament (or mysterious meaning) of the whole Creed." In the Old Gallican (ib. 41.) the Creed is called "the seal of the Catholic Faith, the Sacrament of eternal life." Much of the language is from S. Augustine, who also (Serm. 228 fin.) speaks of the "Sacrament of the Creed, which they ought to believe, the Sacrament of the Lord's prayer, how they ought to ask."

[z] S. Hilary in S. Matt. c. 5.

spiritual virtue," we "offer to God of His own, and the Father recognizes the Son's own words[a];" or "Holy Scripture[b]," because it has a Divine power placed within it, as the word emanating from the Word; or "Martyrdom[c]," because it is a renewal of Baptism, being a sharing of the Baptism, wherewith our Lord was baptized.

And, while this would be beneficial to ourselves and no approximation to any error, it could not fail to attract the respect of our brethren in the Romish Communion, when they saw that we denied to these rites the name and character of true Sacraments of Christ, not as undervaluing them as His gifts through His Church, nor from an irreverent habit of mind, but rather from exceeding reverence for those two,—one of which, Holy Baptism, it is the tendency of their own system to lower, but—which are the special witnesses of His Presence in the Church, the pledges of His love, engrafting and cementing the members of His Church into Himself, and deriving His life into them; those two which issued from His pierced Side, in the hour when our Redemption was completed.

Article xxviii.

"Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine, in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be

[a] S. Cyprian de Orat. Dom. §. 5. and 1. he speaks §. 5. of the "Sacraments of the Lord's prayer." See also S. Aug. note y.

[b] S. Hil. ap. Jewel, l. c.

[c] S. Jerome Ep. 69. ad Ocean. quoted ib.

proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

A right notion of what is meant by Transubstantiation is of the more importance to us, because there is no more common hindrance to the reception of the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, than the confused ideas prevalent about it. Nothing is more common than for any high statements of that doctrine to be attacked under the name of Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation. Persons acknowledge in act, (there is reason to trust,) what they dare not realize in words. They rightly dread the gross and carnal doctrine, rejected by our Church as Transubstantiation; they rightly shrink from that of Consubstantiation, as being an approach to it; and more justly might they reject both doctrines as novel, unauthorized, and rationalizing ways of explaining the *mode* of Divine mysteries; "how these things can be." But not having any clear notions what is meant by these statements, they dread to acknowledge any spiritual unseen presence of that blessed Body and Blood, and thus incur the risk of losing much of the awe with which those holy Mysteries should be approached and received, the belief of the actualness of their own union with Christ, the reality of their being temples of the Holy Ghost, and their own consequent consecration, and the comforts which they might also have in the belief of this union of earth and Heaven, of their real incorpo-

ration in the mystical Body of their Lord, and their receiving in themselves the pledge of their Resurrection, the earnest of their acceptance at the Day of Judgment. Not knowing what Presence it is which is implied in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as defined in the Roman schools, and popularly received, they shrink from holding any actual Presence at all, other than in the believer's soul, which they dimly apprehend; not knowing what change is implied by Transubstantiation, they dread to avow that there is any change at all, but look on the consecrated elements, as remaining *simply* what they were before, and what to sight they seem. This is a very serious practical evil; and I have stated but the least portion of it; for it is doubtless one concurrent cause why many, it is to be feared, think of the Holy Eucharist solely as a commemorative rite, approach it and depart from it carelessly, or are lukewarm about it, and neglect it altogether. The infrequency of our Communions has been abated, the devoutness of Communicants (as you will yourself have observed in this place among others) has much increased, in proportion as the higher doctrines have been received.

In opposition then to these vague apprehensions, our friend has stated what the doctrine of Transubstantiation opposed in the Articles is;

"The shocking doctrine, that 'the Body of Christ,' as the Article goes on to express it, is not 'given, taken, and

eaten after an heavenly and spiritual manner, but is carnally pressed with the teeth;' that it is a body or substance of a certain extension and bulk in space, and a certain figure and the due disposition of parts, whereas we hold that the only substance such, is the bread which we see."

And a little afterwards[d], in summing up,

"We see then, that, by Transubstantiation, our Article does not confine itself to any abstract theory, nor aim at any definition of the word substance, nor in rejecting it, rejects a word, nor in denying a 'mutatio panis et vini,' is denying every kind of change, but opposes itself to a certain plain and unambiguous statement, not of this or that Council, but one generally received or taught both in the schools and in the multitude, that the material elements are changed into an earthly, fleshly, and organized[e] body, extended in size, distinct in its parts, which is there where the outward appearances of bread and wine are, and only does not meet the senses, nor even that always. Objections against 'substance,' 'nature,' 'change,' 'accidents,' or the like, seem, more or less, questions of words, and inadequate expressions of the great offence which we find in the received Roman views of this sacred doctrine."

[d] p. 51.

[e] e. g. Bonaventura in answer to the question, "Whether the Body of Christ is on the Altar in its own natural dimensions" (quantitas) argues, "The Body of Christ is living; and if living, organic; and if organic, hath dimensions (si organicum, quantum), therefore if on the Altar it be not detached from life, neither is it from dimensions," also "The Body of Christ or Christ sees them and hears, although It speaks not, lest It be discovered, but the outward senses presuppose dimensions; therefore it is there in dimension." L. iv. dist. 10. art. i. q. 2.

One may add, that the same appears from the very words of the Article itself, for it is this carnal doctrine alone which "is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture," (in that S. Paul speaks of that received by Communicants as "bread," 1 Cor. x. 17. xi. 27, 28.) it also "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," as being "an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace," whereas on this theory of Transubstantiation what we see would not be a sign but the reality.

The same view of the Article, that it is "not *any* change which is meant," is given by Bishop Jewel;

"We affirm that the bread and wine are the holy and heavenly mysteries of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that by them Christ Himself, being the true Bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us, as that by faith we verily received His Body and Blood. Yet say we not this so as though we thought, that the nature and substance of the bread and wine is clearly changed and goeth to nothing."

Or to take the statement of a modern Romanist [b], commenting on the articles of Trent,

"The bread and wine after consecration are in the eyes of faith nothing else than the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, not that the bread and wine are annihilated, but because faith thenceforth contemplates there nothing but the Presence of Jesus Christ. This is the sense in which the ancients spoke of a change, but this is not that of the

[b] Courayer on P. Sarpi Hist. du Conc. du Trente, l. iv. t. i. p. 623.

Council, which teaches that the *whole substance of bread and wine is annihilated*, and that there remains nothing but the accidents and appearances. *This* was *then the received doctrine of the Roman schools*, although even to the present day many of their theologians give this opinion only as one simply probable."

The more common statement among the Schoolmen, and in Bellarmine[c], differs in words only,

"The bread is in truth not annihilated, *although nothing remains of it after the consecration.*"

It is intended only to convey the same doctrine with more philosophical accuracy, inasmuch as "annihilation" implies "not merely[d] that nothing remains of a thing, but that it passeth into nothing," "but the elements are not supposed to be reduced to nothing, but to be changed as to their entire substance," "into a better substance," i. e. the Body and Blood of Christ. The other mode of speaking, however, also occurred [e].

This, and no other, is the doctrine of Transubstantiation opposed by our Articles and our great writers; they confess fully the reality of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament, they only do not define the mode of His Presence; they will not so tie down the Omnipotence of Almighty God that the Bread and Wine should not also be the Body

[c] De Euch. iii. 18.

[d] Bonav. l. iv. dist. xi. q. 3. "What is changed into any thing is not annihilated." Thom. Aq. l. iv. Hist. xi. q. 1. art. 2.

[e] It is mentioned by P. Lombard, l. iv. dist. xi. art. 2.

and Blood of Christ; they agree with Catholic antiquity that there is a change, but only not such a change, whereby (in Bishop Jewel's words) "the nature and substance of bread and wine goeth to nothing." This is the received doctrine in the Romish Church, though happily (one must in candour add) not so defined in the Council of Trent.

I need not, for your information, set down any of these passages; this contrast runs through all our writers; a real change, as I said, they gladly accept; a true, real, substantial, Sacramental, Presence of our Lord and His Flesh, the Very Flesh which was born of the Virgin Mary, and is now glorified at God's right hand, they reverently confess; they only confess not, that carnal, scholastic theory which would explain away the Mystery, that the Elements, although the Body and Blood of Christ, are also Bread and Wine. They confess the truth; the mode of its being they leave, like the mystery of the Incarnation whence it is derived, undefined because incomprehensible by man.

Thus, to take some, for the most part already collected to our hands.

Bishop Ridley[e].

"Both you and I agree in this; that *in the Sacrament* is the very, true, and natural, Body and Blood of Christ;

[e] Fox, Acts and Mon. p. 1598, quoted by Laud against Fisher, §. 35.

even that which was born of the Virgin Mary; which ascended into heaven; which sits on the right hand of God the Father; which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead; only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being. We confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I confess Christ's natural Body to be in the Sacrament by spirit and grace, &c. You make a grosser kind of being, inclosing a natural Body under the shape and form of Bread and Wine."

And Bishop Andrews[f].

"The Cardinal is not, unless 'willingly, ignorant,' that Christ hath said, 'This is My Body,' not 'This is not My Body *in this mode.*' Now about the object we are both agreed; all the controversy is about the *mode.* The 'This is,' we firmly believe; that 'it is in this mode' (the bread, namely, being transubstantiated into the Body), or of the mode whereby it is wrought that 'it is,' whether *in*, or *with*, or *under*, or *transubstantiated*, there is not a word in the Gospel. And because not a word is there, we rightly detach it from being a matter of faith; we may place it amongst the decrees of the schools, not among the articles of faith. What Durandus is reported to have said of old, (Neand. Synop. Chron. p. 203.) we approve of. 'We hear the word, feel the effect, know not the manner, believe the Presence.' The Presence, I say, we believe, and that no less true than yourselves. Of the mode of the Presence, we define nothing rashly, nor, I add, do we curiously enquire; no more than how the Blood of Christ cleanseth us in our Baptism; no more than how in the Incarnation of Christ the human nature is united into the same Person with the Divine. We rank it among Mysteries, (and indeed the Eucharist itself is a

[f] Answer to Bellarmine, c. i. p. 11.

mystery,) 'that which remaineth, ought to be burnt with fire,' (Ex. xii. 13.) that is, as the Fathers elegantly express it, to be adored by faith, not examined by reason."

And Bishop Montague [g], (alleging Bishop Bilson,)

"The disagreement is only in de modo præsentiæ, the thing is yielded to on either side, that there is in the holy Eucharist a real Presence. 'God forbid,' saith Bishop Bilson, 'we should deny that the Flesh and Blood of Christ are truly present and truly received of the faithful at the Lord's table. It is the doctrine that we teach others, and comfort ourselves withal." (p. 779 of the subject.)

And again [h],

"Be contented with, that it is "The Body of Christ," and do not seek and define how it is so, and we shall not contest nor contend, which God forbid the Church of England should maintain, said Bishop Bilson."

Bishop Forbes [i].

"The doctrine of those Protestants and others seems most safe and true, who are of opinion, nay, most firmly believe, that the Body and Blood of Christ is truly, *really*, and *substantially* present in the Eucharist, and received, but in a manner incomprehensible in respect of human reason and ineffable, known to God alone, and not revealed to us in the Scriptures, not corporal, yet neither in the mind alone, or through faith alone, but in another way, known, as was said, to God alone, and to be left to His Omnipotence."

[g] Appeal, c. 30. init. p. 289.

[h] ib. fin. p. 297.

[i] Consid. Modestæ, De Euchar. l. i. c. i. §. 7.

Archbishop Laud [k].

"His Altar, as the greatest place of God's residence upon earth, (I say the greatest,) yea, greater than the pulpit. For there 'tis 'Hoc est Corpus Meum,' 'This is My Body.' But in the pulpit 'tis at most, 'Hoc est verbum Meum,' 'This is My word.' And a greater reverence (no doubt) is due to the Body than to the word of our Lord. And so in relation, answerably to the throne, where His Body is usually present, than to the seat where His word useth to be proclaimed."

Bp. Taylor again fully admits, that the terms "real," "substantial," and even "corporeal," Presence might have a sound sense, if this last be understood as opposed to "figurative" or "in type;" and that the very words of the article of Trent, "the Saviour is sacramentally present with us in His Substance,"

"if they might be understood in the sense, in which the Protestants use them, that is, really, truly, without fiction or the help of fancy, but "in rei veritate" so as Philo calls spiritual things, ἀναγκαιόταται οὐσίαι, 'most necessary, useful, and material substances,' might become an instrument of united confession."

Nor does he hesitate to acknowledge what some, accustomed to the modern generalizing way of speaking, would at once identify with Transubstantiation, that by the "real Presence" is meant the

[k] Speech in the Star Chamber 1637, p. 47.

[l] Of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament init.

Presence of that very Body which our Blessed Saviour took of the Virgin Mary.

"It is enquired[m], whether when we say, we believe Christ's Body to be 'really' in the Sacrament, we mean 'that Body, that Flesh, that was born of the Virgin Mary,' that was crucified, dead, and buried. I answer, I know none else that He had or hath, there is but one Body of Christ natural and glorified; but he that says, that Body is glorified, which was crucified, says, it is the same Body, but not after the same manner: and so it is in the Sacrament, We eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ, that was broken and poured forth: for there is no other Body, no other Blood of Christ: but though it is the same we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner. And therefore when any of the protestant Divines or any of the Fathers deny that Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified, to be eaten in the Sacrament, as Bertram, as St. Hierom, as Clemens Alexandrinus expressly affirm, the meaning is easy; they intend that it is not eaten in a natural sense."

I would add one more extract on the Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, both as containing in itself several other testimonies, and as occurring in a Charge[n], animadverting upon some of the language used on other subjects in our Tracts.

"When any of us speak of this great mystery in terms best suited to its spiritual nature; when, for instance, we speak of the real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist, there is raised a cry, as if we were symbolizing with the Church of Rome, and as if this

[m] V. ib. §. 8.

[n] Bishop of Exeter's Charge, p. 69—71.

Presence, because it is real, can be nothing else than the gross, carnal, corporeal, presence indicated in Transubstantiation. Now here, as with respect to Baptism, I will not argue the point, but will merely refer to the language of our Church in those authorized declarations of its doctrine to which we have assented, and in those formularies which we have both expressly approved and solemnly engaged to use.

"It is very true, that none of these declarations or formularies use the phrase 'real Presence;' and therefore, if any should attempt to impose the use of that phrase as necessary, he would be justly open to censure for requiring what the Church does not require. But, on the other hand, if we adopt the phrase, as not only aptly expressing the doctrine of the Church, but also as commended to our use by the practice of the soundest Divines of the Church of England, in an age more distinguished for depth, as well as soundness, of Theology than the present—such as Abp. Bramhall[o], Sharp[p], and Wake[r], (all of whom do not only express their own judgment, but also are witnesses of the general judgment of the Church in, and before, their days; 'No genuine son of the Church of England,' says Bramhall, 'did ever deny a true real Presence;') if, I say, we adopt the phrase, used by such men as these, and even by some of those, who at the Reformation sealed with their blood their testimony to the Truth against the doctrine of Rome, (I allude especially to Bishops Ridley and Latimer[s]—and even to Cranmer, who, when he avoided the phrase so abused by the Romanists, did yet employ equivalent

[o] Works, i. p. 15.

[p] Sermons, vol. vii. p. 368.

[r] Discourse on the Holy Eucharist, c. 2. "Of the real Presence acknowledged by the Church of England."

[s] Ridley in Fox, p. 61. Latimer ib. p. 65. Cranmer, Preface to book against Gardiner, &c.

words,) it will be sufficient for the justification both of them and of us to shew, that the language of the Church itself does in fact express the same thing though in different terms. Still, I fully admit, that Christian discretion would bid us forbear from the use of the phrase, if the objection to it were founded on a sincere apprehension of giving offence to tender consciences; and not, as there is too much reason to believe, on an aversion to the great truth which it is employed to express."

Again, Thorndike[t] thus speaks of the change made by Consecration, only denying it to be *such* a change as involves the abolition of the Elements.

"Upon these premises, I am content to go to issue as concerning the sense of the Catholic Church in this point. If it can any where be shewed, that the Church did ever pray that the Flesh and Blood might be substituted instead of the elements, under the accidents of them, then I am content, that this be counted henceforth the Sacramental presence of them in the Eucharist. But if the Church only pray that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the elements, may make them the Body and Blood of Christ, so that they which received them may be filled with the grace of His Spirit; then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church, that can oblige any man to believe the abolishing of the elements, in their bodily substance; because, supposing that they remain, they may nevertheless become the instrument of God's Spirit to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it, no otherwise than His Flesh and Blood conveyed the efficacy thereof upon earth. And that I suppose is reason enough, to call it the Body and Blood of Christ Sacramentally, that is to say, as in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. It is not here to be denied, that all Ecclesias-

[t] Epilogue iii. 4. p. 30.

tical writers do, with one mouth, bear witness to the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. Neither will any one of them be found to ascribe it to any thing but the consecration, or that to any faith, but that, upon which the Church professeth to proceed to the celebrating of it. And upon this account, when they speak of the elements, supposing the consecration to have passed upon them, they always call them by the name not of their bodily substance, but of the Body and Blood of Christ which they are become."

And, after having shewn this in detail, he thus sums up the evidence[w] of the Fathers, in contradistinction to the modern view which would make the only Presence of Christ in the believer's soul, and that as resulting, not from the consecrating words, but from the believer's faith.

"I will go no further in rehearsing the texts of the Fathers, which are to be found in all books of controversies concerning this, for the examination of them requires a volume on purpose. It shall be enough, that they all acknowledge the elements to be changed, translated, and turned into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood; though as in a Sacrament, that is, mystically: yet therefore by virtue of the consecration, not of his faith that receives."

He then establishes "on the other side[x] that this change is to be understood with that abatement, which the nature and substance of the elements requires, supposing it to remain the same as it was," shewing from the same authors[y], and from

[w] p. 31. [x] p. 32, 3. [y] p. 33, 4.

the Canon of the Mass, that they imply that "the heavenly grace hinders not, nor destroys the earthly nature," and thus concludes:

"And upon these premises, I conclude, that, as it is by no means to be denied that the elements are really changed, translated, turned, and converted into the Body and Blood of Christ; (so that whoso receiveth them with a living faith, is spiritually nourished by the same, he that with a dead faith, is guilty of crucifying Christ;) yet is not this change destructive of the bodily substance of the elements, but cumulative of them, with the spiritual grace of Christ's Body and Blood; so that the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, turns to the nourishment of the body, whether the Body and Blood in the truth, turn to the nourishment and damnation of the soul."

Again, such writers as Bp. Cosins and the holy Bp. Ken, think it no contradiction to the words of our rubric that "the *natural* Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here," to affirm that "Christ's Flesh comes to us to be our food," that "Christ Who is in heaven, is also on the Altar," i. e. that He is there really, though not in a carnal manner.

Bp. Cosins[z].

"We confess with the Fathers, that the 'mode' is ineffable and unsearchable, that is, not to be enquired and searched into by reason, but to be believed by faith alone. For although it seems incredible, that in so great a distance of place, Christ's Flesh should come to us, to be

[z] Hist. Trans. c. 3. §. 3.

our food; yet we must remember, how much the power of the Holy Spirit is above our understanding, and how foolish it is to measure His immensity by our capacity. But what our understanding comprehends not, let faith conceive."

Bp. Ken[a].

"O God Incarnate, how Thou canst give us Thy Flesh to eat and Thy Blood to drink; how Thy Flesh is meat indeed; how Thou Who art in Heaven, art present on the Altar, I can by no means explain; but I firmly believe it all, because Thou hast said it, and I firmly rely on Thy love and on Thy omnipotence, to make good Thy word, though the manner of doing it I cannot comprehend."

Of course, great care and wisdom must be used by any in reclaiming a term, which, like that of the "real Presence," has acquired a sense very different from its original, lest they seem to be using it in a Romish, rather than in a Catholic, sense; and indeed, on this whole subject, great reverence is needed, that none take a sort of pleasure in reclaiming words, because the use of them is now unwonted; for myself, I have preferred keeping to the words of our formularies; they are so full of doctrine that one seems to need no more, and they come with authority; yet other turns of expression, such as are sanctioned by some of the great writers above quoted, that 'the Body and Blood of Christ are really present,' might often be adopted without offence, when the words 'real Presence'

[a] Exposition of Church Catechism, licensed 1685.

would, from long use, rather suggest to the mind the Romish *mode* of defining that Presence. But, whether any use the term or no in ordinary instruction, it is very important to vindicate it in the abstract, and shew that our Church in excepting against Transubstantiation, objects only to the scholastic mode of explaining the great doctrine which she holds,—a true, ' real Presence.'

It will be familiar to you, that scarcely any argument is now more common among Romanist controversialists than one founded on the wrong use of this term; they prove, at once, from Scripture, the doctrine of the " Real Presence," and then infer (as though involved in it) that of Transubstantiation[z], i. e. they affirm the truth, and then infer from it their own mode of defining that truth; and whereas our writers above quoted affirm that the question between us relates not to the Presence, but to the *mode* of the Presence, these, having proved the Sacred Presence, assume the only point at issue, the *mode* of the Presence. And this is, on their part, not unnatural, as having,

[z] Dr. Wiseman, Lectures 1836, Lect. 14—16, entitled on " Transubstantiation." In the Advertisement to vol. 2. it is said, " the tenth lecture was upon the Real Presence *or* Transubstantiation," as though they were altogether the same. So also Dr. Butler's " Truths of the Catholic Religion," Lect 1—5. Bellarmine treats the two doctrines (as they are) as distinct; the " Real Presence," de sacr. Euch. l. i. ii. Transubstantiation or " the *mode* of the existence of the Body of the Lord in the Eucharist." l. iii.

out of our Church, to do with those who deny any peculiar Presence of Christ in the Sacrament; yet, on the other hand, will it tend to draw away from our Church those of affectionate minds and childlike belief, who, seeking a real, substantial, union with their Redeemer,—to be, by the communication of His Body and Blood "verily and indeed" to their souls, knit in one to Him, "be one with Him and He with them,"—are, through inadequate statements of the reality of this holy Mystery, taught to seek in the Romish Communion, what is stored up for them in our own. Such minds enter not into any of the difficulties of the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation; they acknowledge it, not in the sense of the Roman schools, but as implying the same real change which our own authors assert; they acquiesce in it as a name, but believe, under that name, that doctrine only, for whose sake they received it, the real true unfigurative Presence of their Redeeming Lord.

Article xxxi.

"The sacrifices (sacrificia) of Masses in which it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits (perniciosæ imposturæ)."

In explanation of this Article, our friend con-

tends, that by the "sacrifices of masses" is not meant "the sacrifice of the Mass;" much less then the Primitive practice of commemorating the faithful departed at the Holy Eucharist, or the belief that they derived benefit thereby. He says,

"Here the sacrifice of the Mass is not spoken of, in which the special question of doctrine would be introduced; but the sacrifice of Masses, certain observances for the most part private and solitary, which the writers of the Articles saw before their eyes and knew to have been in force in time past, and which involved certain opinions and a certain teaching."

And this, one should think, was sufficiently clear, 1) from the language of the Article itself, for why should it be supposed that "the sacrifices of Masses" meant "the sacrifice in *the* Mass?" 2) from the language of writers of the time, who by "Masses" always mean "private Masses[a]." 3) They were the "private Masses" alone, which were said for the sake of gain, or were a source of

[a] e. g. In Sir T. More's, Supplication of souls, they say, "we have been eased and holpen and relieved both by the priests' prayers, of good virtuous people, and especially by the daily masses and other ghostly suffrages of priests, religious, and folk of Holy Church;" (quoted at length, Tract 81. p. 9.) add Cranmer, Defence of the Catholic Doctrine v. 16. (quoted ib. p. 11.) where he contrasts the "many masses every day," "the daily private masses," "the selling masses," with "the one common mass in a day," still existing in the Greek Church.

gain, which our Article condemns as "perniciosæ imposturæ." This he has sufficiently illustrated out of the Homilies, Bishop Bull, Burnet, and even the Council of Trent, or to add one passage only out of Bishop Jewel [b].

"Then ye began to tell the simple that it was sufficient for them to sit by; that your mass was a propitiatory sacrifice for their sins; that it was available unto them, ex opere operato, although they understood not what it meant: that you had power to apply it to quick and dead, and to whom ye listed; and that the very hearing thereof, of itself was meritorious. Upon this foundation ye erected up your Chanteries, your Monasteries, your pardons, your supererogations, and I know not what. Thus was the Holy Communion quite forgotten. Thus were your Masses multiplied above number. Thus ye came by that ye would have called your old gold."

The very point objected to by Bp. Jewel throughout this Article is "the plurality of masses;" the very form of Legacy was, that "masses" might be said for the soul of the departed, and these were private, special, masses (not the public service of the Mass) applied, as our Article says, to "quick and dead," or, as Bp. Jewel, "to whom ye listed." It was held in the Schools, that particular masses were more profitable to the souls in Purgatory than the mass. Bonaventura [c] says,

"Suffrages are to release from pain or guilt; but it is

[b] Answer to Harding, Art. 13. Plurality of Masses, Dis. 3.

[c] L. iv. ol. 45. art. 2. q. 3.

more to make satisfaction for the debt of many than of one, and satisfaction is made more easily for the debt of one than of many; therefore two need more suffrages than one; therefore, if they are divided between them, each has less; therefore, it does not seem that it extends equally to all."

It was also held, that whereas the "suffrages[d] of the Church in common benefitted most, cæteris paribus, those who most deserved to be benefitted, those offered specially, benefitted those most for whom they were performed;" and this they must hold, since, if their special masses did not most benefit those for whom they were offered, "the Church[d] which offered them did absurdly."

Of course, as far as the ordinary oblation of the mass was considered as relating to the same ends, the Romish doctrine would be condemned in it also; but there is this difference, that the erroneous doctrine was the sole foundation and groundwork of the particular masses, it was their whole substance; as Bonaventura says, they had no other object or ground, than the belief, that the masses said specially for departed souls, benefitted them, (in the words of the Article,) "to have remission of pain or guilt;" whereas, as no such end is expressed in the Canon of the Mass, so it is also an appendage only to its doctrine, engrafted in later times upon it. Thus, the special masses drew men's thoughts entirely to themselves; what was

[d] Ib.

supposed to be effected by the public sacrifice of the mass for the relief of souls in Purgatory was general only; no one could feel assured what share in the benefit his own friends had; it would be (in the doctrine of the Schools) "according to his deserts:" the special "masses," on the contrary, afforded a definite relief; they had no other end in view than that of applying to the relief of the individuals the infinite merits of Christ; they concentrated the benefits of the Meritorious Sacrifice of the Cross, which they were thought to renew, upon the "remission of pain and guilt" of a single soul. I cannot then but think that the writers of the Article had, as our friend says, the "private, special, masses" mainly in view, although including the "public mass" as far as in doctrine it agreed with them.

And this doctrine it is important for people to view distinctly, lest, taking the words in a vague way, they should involve Catholic truth in the Romish error against which our Article is directed. In this Article, then, the popular Romish doctrine is described as a whole, that in "the sacrifices of masses" as "was commonly said," "the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain and guilt." This is condemned as a whole, and it is obviously no legitimate interpretation to omit a portion of this doctrine, and infer that the writers of the Article would have condemned the rest without it. The errors it pre-

supposes are the Romish doctrines of Transubstantiation and Purgatory, which are condemned elsewhere separately, to which it here adds the "common" statement of the doctrine of the "sacrifices of masses," which readily follows upon Transubstantiation, the "repetition of the sacrifice of Christ." It presupposes that the departed for whom it was offered, were held to be in a state of "pain and guilt," to obtain remission of them by that offering, and that, not an oblation or sacrifice commemorative of the One Sacrifice, and thereby acceptable to God, but of Christ Himself. "Then if the Priest do offer the Sacrament, he doth offer indeed Christ Himself[b]." Any doctrine which does not involve these statements is not the doctrine condemned by the Articles. This Bishop Ridley himself might alone shew, for he states his objection to the Romish doctrine of the Sacrifice to be founded on the error of Transubstantiation. "Transubstantiation is the very foundation, whereon all their erroneous doctrine doth stand;" and "*This kind* of oblation [the Romish] standeth upon Transubstantiation his cousin-german, and they do both grow upon the same ground." And the celebrated dictum of Bishop Andrewes[c], which has passed almost into a proverbial statement of the principles of our

[b] Respons. ad Card. Bell. c. 8.

[c] Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper, p. 6. 17. 16. quoted more at length, Tract 81. p. 10.

Church, is but a following out of this of Bishop Ridley, "Do ye take away from the mass your Transubstantiation, and we shall not long have any question about the Sacrifice." Bp. Jewel also in like words[c], states this to be the only point at issue. "S. Cyprian saith, 'we offer our Lord's cup mixed with wine.' But he saith not as you say, 'we offer up *the Son of God substantially and really* unto the Father.' Take away *only this blasphemy* wherewith you have deceived the world, and then talk of mingling the cup, and of the Sacrifice whilst ye list." They are not the words then, "offer Christ," which are in themselves condemned, but the doctrine of a real sacrifice of Christ Himself, distinct from the sacrifice of the Cross; the words may be found in Christian Antiquity, but not in this meaning, whereas in those later times it certainly was again and again stated, that there was in the Holy Eucharist not only a sacramental oblation of His sacrifice, pleading Its merits, and so obtaining mercy from God, but "a real and true sacrifice of the Son of God[d]," by virtue of Transubstantiation; "a sacrifice," in the words of a recent apologist[e], "truly real, because Jesus Christ is really therein

[c] Defence of Apology, p. 2. c. 5. v. fin. p. 140.

[d] See Courayer's comment on Bishop Jewel's objections to Harding's statements of the doctrine, Defense de la Diss. sur la validité des Ordin. Angl. iv. 6. quoted Tract 81, p. 44—46.

[e] Dr. Butler, lect. 8. p. 228.

contained, and really in it, under the symbols of His Passion, offered up to His Eternal Father:" and it is used as an argument[f] of the infinite value of that Sacrifice, that "the thing offered is of infinite dignity, inasmuch as *whole* Christ is offered." It is the corporeal offering of the Son of God which alone is objected to. Again, the words "to have remission of pain and guilt" restrain the condemnation in the Article to the application of Masses to souls in Purgatory; "the Sacrifice[g] benefits also very much the faithful departed who are being purged in Purgatory, to the mitigation and payment of punishments. This is to be held as matter of faith, as is clear from the Council of Trent, cap. 22. can. 3."

It is only questioned in the Roman schools whether it confers this benefit by the very act of offering (ex opere operato) or by way of impetration;

"It benefits[h] in both ways, some deny that it doth by the mere act of offering, as Melch. Canus, Dom. Soto, for they say that this sacrifice has not an infallible effect, but 'if God so will.' Whence it appears, that it does not benefit ex opere operato, since the fruit of this is altogether infallible in one capable of it, who does not place any bar; but the contrary is more probable, as held by Ricardus, art. 6. P. Soto. Lect. 7. de Euch. D. Thom. P. iv. D. 45. q. 2. n. 3. ad 3." "It

[f] Less. de Purg. art. i. dub. 10.

[g] Less. ib. dub. 9.

[h] Ib.

confers[i] benefit ex opere operato, which mode all Doctors and the more recent who write against heresies admit." "It confers[k] ex opere operato remission of temporal punishment."

The very words "pain or guilt" (pœnæ vel culpæ) which the Article uses, are those employed by the Schoolmen, who lay down, that "the punishment of Purgatory can cleanse us from the guilt (culpa) of venial, and from the punishment (pœna) of mortal sin[l]." And this it is which even Cranmer objects to, the "propitiatory sacrifice of the priests in their masses, whereby they may remit sin and redeem souls out of purgatory[m]."

Such then being the limitations which the Article itself furnishes,—that the doctrine which it condemns is one which implies Transubstantiation, a repetition of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the deliverance of souls from pain and guilt in Purgatory, it follows that no other doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice is contemplated by it. That solemn doctrine has been maintained by the chief Divines and Bishops of our Church ever since the Reformation as before it, only separate from the errors

[i] Ib. dub. 7.

[k] Ib. dub. 8.

[l] See Bonav. L. iv. dist. 21. q. 2. p. 1. art. 2. who quotes also Alex. Alen. 4. p. q. 13. memb. 3. art. 3. §. 5. Richard. 4. Sent. d. 21. art. 2. q. 1. Steph. Brulef. 4. Sent. d. 21. q. 3. Pet. de Tarent. ib. q. 1.

[m] Answer to Gardiner, b. v. f. 3. p. 544. see Tract 81, p. 48, 49.

formerly blended with it; the language in which they have expressed it, has varied, as they have feared that the one or the other expression might countenance errors held in the Church of Rome; but it is clear, from the first, that what Cranmer and Ridley meant to object to were the Romish errors, not the truth; and as our position became more defined, and there was less apprehension that such errors should find place among our people, that truth came to be more definitely and systematically enounced. Both these points have been recently treated of, and the statements of our Divines given at such length[n], that it is not necessary here to speak further on the subject. I will therefore only select two specimens, one shewing that the very words "propitiatory[o] and impetratory," as applied to the Eucharistic Sacrifice in a sound

[n] Tract 81, "Testimony of writers of the later English Church to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice," and its Preface.

[o] "Propitiatory" is, as Thorndike explains it, that which "doth render God propitious;" it is thus used by a modern Romanist also, "we say, the Mass" [the Holy Eucharist] "is a propitiatory sacrifice, that is to say, a sacrifice that renders God propitiatory to men." Dr. Butler's Lect. 8. p. 226. Bp. Overall adopts the word as occurring in the fathers, Tract 81, p. 73. and others also. In the same sense, Nelson prays "that I may so importunately plead the merit of it" [the full perfect oblation on the Cross] "in this commemoration of that Sacrifice, as to *render* Thee gracious and *propitious* to me, a miserable sinner." ib. p. 303. Those who with Bp. Jewel (ib. p. 61.) and Bp. Hall, (ib. p. 107.) take "propitiatory" in the sense of "being" or "making a propitiation," must reject it.

sense, are not objected to by approved Divines in our Church; the other as a distinct and clear enunciation of the doctrine from one of her present Bishops.

The first are words of the learned Thorndike [p].

"After the consecration is past, having shewed you, that St. Paul hath appointed, that, at the celebration of the Eucharist, prayers, supplications, and intercessions be made for all estates of the world and of the Church; and that the Jews have no right to the Eucharist, (according to the Epistle to the Hebrews,) because, though Eucharistical, yet it is of that kind, the Blood whereof is offered to God within the veil, with prayers for all estates of the world, as Philo and Josephus inform us; seeing the Apostle hath so plainly expounded us the accomplishment of that figure, in the offering of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross to the Father in the highest heavens, to obtain the benefits of His Passion for us; and that the Eucharist is nothing else but the representation here upon earth, of what is done there; these things, I say, considered, necessarily it follows, that whoso believes, the prayers of the Church, made in our Lord's Name, do render God propitious to them for whom they are made, and obtain for them the benefits of Christ's Death, (which he that believes not is no Christian,) cannot question that those which are made by St. Paul's appointment, at the celebration of the Eucharist, offering up unto God the merits and sufferings of Christ there represented, must be peculiarly and especially effectual to the same purposes. And that the Eucharist may very properly be accounted a sacrifice propitiatory and impetratory both, in this regard; because the offering of it up to God, with and by the same prayers, doth render God propitious, and obtain

[p] Epilogue iii. 5. p. 42. quoted Tract 81, p. 169.

at His hands the benefits of Christ's Death which it representeth; there can be no cause to refuse, being no more than the simplicity of plain Christianity enforceth."

I add the other statement the rather, as being so concise and yet so full an exposition of the doctrine, withdrawing nothing of the truth, and yet so conveying it, that none can think that it goes beyond it.

"Not[p] only is the entrance into the Church by a visible sign, but that body is visible also in the appointed means of sustaining the new life, especially in that most sacred and sublime mystery of our religion, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the commemorative Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ; in which the action and suffering of our great High Priest are represented and offered to God on earth, as they are continually by the same High Priest Himself in heaven; the Church on earth doing, after its manner, the same thing as its Head in heaven; Christ in heaven presenting the Sacrifice and applying it to its purposed end, properly and gloriously; the Church on earth commemoratively and humbly, yet really and effectually, by praying to God (with thanksgiving) in the virtue and merit of that Sacrifice which it thus exhibits."

Article xxii.

"The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons (de indulgentiis), worshipping (de veneratione) and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing (res est futilis) vainly (inaniter) invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant (contradicit) to the word of God."

[p] Charge of the Bishop of Exeter, 1836, p. 43, 44.

In speaking of this Article, it is necessary to bear in mind, as our friend has said, that the question is, not what is allowable to be taught, not what it is expedient to practise, but what private opinions a person may or may not hold, consistently with the tenor of the Articles. We received our commission to teach in this our Church, wherein we were made members of Christ, through her Bishops; as then we have ample scope for teaching, in what she holds and delivers out of or agreeable to Holy Scripture, so we have no commission to teach opinions, which she practically excludes. Even as to practices, which *are* Catholic[q], as prayers for departed saints, a Minister of our Church would, I think, do wrong to inculcate in his sermons, any thing for which his Church gives no countenance. Much more as to points, which, not being Catholic, have no authority from the Church, as the interpreter of Holy Scripture, any more than from the direct teaching of Scripture itself. Still more, again, as to any such points, which, not being Catholic, have also once degenerated into dangerous errors; their introduction would too pro-

[q] By "Catholic *practices*," I mean such as were universally received in the Church; "the Catholic *Faith*" is that Faith which the Church taught universally out of the Holy Scripture, and which is embodied in the Creeds. The Catholic Faith is necessary to salvation, and nothing of it may be parted with; Catholic practice may be laid aside, (as in this case by our Church,) if there be any constraining cause; though, of course, with reverence and circumspection.

bably favour the bringing back of those errors, which were once derived from them, and which yet exist. The likelihood of *any* purgatorial process after this life cannot be safely taught even by any who holds it, while the Romish doctrine of purgatory still exists; apostrophes to saints to pray for us, if they hear us, which—detached as they were from regular devotion and sparingly as they occurred—we find without apprehension of injury in the mouths of holy men at the close of the fourth century, would countenance idolatry in this. It would be trifling with the deposit of a pure faith which God has committed to our keeping, and tampering with the souls of our people whom we might be leading into sin, were any one to teach such points as these. Much more strongly may one say, should any in this place abstain from inculcating upon the minds of the young, what, as being young, they might probably exaggerate, and give an undue prominence to in their own minds. But of this, I may safely say, there has been no instance, nor is there any tendency to it. People in this place are far too much impressed with their own responsibility, and feel too deeply how much is at issue at this great crisis, to lead the minds entrusted to them off to any such questions as these, so far removed, in any case, from the centre of Christian life and doctrine. But even apart from consequences, our office, as we have often repeated, is within our Church; to develope, bring out, incul-

cate her teaching, not add to her of our own minds what we have not received.

But, assuming this, the question which our friend had in view was, as I said, not what a Minister might do, but what is the meaning of the Article. And, here, it seems to me equally plain, and it is almost a truism to state, that since the Article definitely speaks of the "Romish doctrine" on these points, it does not mean to condemn any other. What opinion any of the framers of the Articles may have had as to any doctrine on these points, *not Romish*, or whether they had formed to themselves any definite view, is altogether beside the question; they were not drawing up a system of faith, which should comprehend the whole compass of the subject on which they spoke, but setting definite marks against certain corruptions existing and maintained in their own times, and before their eyes; they were practically providing against a certain existing practical evil; they were not concerned to trace the origin of existing corruptions, but to warn against them as they existed; every thing else lay beyond their horizon, and they were not contemplating it; it was not their concern, whether such or such a doctrine, approximating in whatever degree to the Romish, were found here and there in the early Church; rather, with their practical veneration for the first ages of the Gospel, the writers of those times, when they do touch upon any such points, point out

the difference sooner than the resemblance, rather shew that what is found in primitive Antiquity is not Romish, than seek to identify it with the form, into which, (if it were so,) it, in later ages, passed.

The very wording of the Article "Romish doctrine," or, as it before stood, "doctrine of the Schoolmen," shews what was in the mind of the writers; had they meant to condemn every doctrine of "purgatory" or "invocation of saints," they would obviously not have restrained their censure by the insertion of the word "Romish." No one could seriously contend, that while they spoke against the "Romish" doctrine of purgatory, they meant to include any views held by the "Greeks," or the belief in any purgatorial process, distinct from the Romish, whether supposed to take place at the entrance of Paradise or at the Day of Judgment. So to interpret the articles would manifestly be a mere inference, founded on the supposed opinions of the writers, which, since they did not choose to express, we have no right to intrude upon their words. It were an arbitrary stretch of their meaning, opening the way to any other comments. And yet it would probably be found that the popular system of interpretation, which our friend opposed, did this; and not only in points, in which no direct evil consequences would result, but where true doctrine would be affected.

I am not herein speaking of any thing in this

place, where a tone of more accurate thought prevails, (as neither was our friend's Tract written for persons here,) but of the vague way in which the doctrines censured in this Article are popularly misunderstood, and the injury to sound doctrine or to habits of mind thence ensuing. Thus, one cannot but know, that together with the "Romish doctrine of pardons," persons are taught to shrink from the whole subject of primitive discipline, as something interfering between the soul and its Redeemer, instead of being beneficial to it; that they would regard the recommendation of confession,—not as an essential to absolution, but as expedient and healthful, yet with the view not merely of "obtaining ghostly advice and comfort," but of taking shame before men,—as something Popish; or again they would at once condemn all thought of penance and self-chastisement for specific sins, as connected with the Romish doctrine of "satisfaction;" or they look with suspicion on any statement, that the Absolution solemnly pronounced in Christ's Name, "by His authority committed unto us," is not merely a comfortable "declaration" of His mercies, but may alter the state of the soul in God's sight; that it is not merely a relaxation of "ecclesiastical censures," which we have not, but may tend to "loose the bands of those sins, which by our frailty we have committed," and remove the obstructions which sin presents to the shining in of the grace of Christ upon the soul. There is, as you are

aware, a large negative theory on these subjects afloat, too little informed, to know what it apprehends, and so apprehending every thing; morbidly sensitive of any thing which it thinks may unduly exalt the Priestly office, but careless as to securing our individual humility and self-discipline; condemning under names whose real meaning people know not, doctrines and holy practices, whose efficacy they have never tried; anxious to secure our irresponsibility to man, our freedom from external control, the non-interference of man between the soul and its Maker, but not anxious how to secure our sense of responsibility to God, our exemption from lawlessness, our attainment of all those blessings, which God intended for us, as ministered through man; jealous against superstition, not against irreverence. Thus, together with the "Romish doctrine of pardons," the whole subject of Absolution is often discarded; with Purgatory, the intermediate state; with invocation of Saints, the feeling of communion with them in the one Church, of which they are the perfected members; with the veneration of relics, the feeling that "precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints," and the belief in the miracles, which, in some cases at least in the early Church, He certainly wrought through them; thus admitting in fact the very principles of infidelity, and rejecting on à priori notions what were after all the "mighty works" of God's hand; or together with the un-Ca-

tholic veneration of images, people reject as superstitious all outward reverence for holy things and places; they regard the Altar, whence the holy Mysteries of our Redemption are distributed, as no ways distinguished above the rest of God's House, nor that House itself as sanctified by the presence of Angels and the unseen coming of our Lord. The mere Protestant walks up and down with his hat on, "on holy ground," listening to the solemn tones of the organ at Haarlem.

It is then, practically also, of moment to distinguish what our Article does condemn as Romish, lest we involve under it feelings, and doctrines, and practices, which are primitive. It is of moment to us practically, since it cannot be concealed that many are deterred from practices, which, though not essential, might still be a great safe-guard to them, and are countenanced or (under certain circumstances) recommended by our Church, by the fear of approximating to something corrupt in the Romish system. Thus, one cannot doubt, that the more frequent use of Confession to God's Ministers, (which our Church recommends in certain cases as a preparation for the Holy Communion or for death,) would be a great relief to persons' consciences, a great protection against the corruptions which gradually steal over and steal away the young, a great promoter of conscientiousness. One cannot doubt again, that the restoration "fourfold" of what has been wrongly gotten,

or liberal distribution to the poor, in token of sorrow for sin and love to Him Who we trust will remit it, (which our Church recommends by the example of Zacchæus,) or the acts of humiliation of which she speaks with regret in her service for Ash-Wednesday, would be very healthful to persons' souls, and not any way approximate to the abuses of the Romish Confessional or their system of penances. And for our Church generally, it is notorious that this indiscriminate condemnation of what may be a means of holiness, together with what is unholy in the practical system of Rome, is one of the most dangerous allurements to persons to seek in the Romish Communion, what they might have found, without its corruptions, in our own.

But, beyond this, it is of course right, without any view to consequences at all, to adhere to the truth; and so not to extend any condemnation in our Articles to points not contemplated in them, even though unauthorized, or, as the result may have shewn, dangerous. We may not forfeit truth for expediency; if then our Articles be not so rigid, as some on a cursory view might imagine, and so do not exclude things unadvisable, which some might wish had been peremptorily excluded, we must not seek protection against their introduction by extending the meaning of our Articles, but in some other way, and trust in God's good Providence for our safety, not look for it by maintaining

an interpretation which, though convenient, is untrue. It does not follow, then, that because any may maintain a certain doctrine or practice not to be condemned by our Articles, he therefore thinks that it would not be very inexpedient or, under the circumstances, unlawful; the use of the "ora pro nobis" (of which I shall have to speak presently) would probably in almost, if not all, cases, be so; still, if the terms of our Articles do not pronounce upon it, we must be content to think that it is best thus, and seek for a remedy against any contingent risk in some other way.

To enter then a little into the details, which our friend, (as he has since stated,) omitted in the first instance to consider, lest he should seem to imply any definite practices to be allowable, which he only shewed our Articles not to disallow, the framers not seeing any necessity to pronounce upon them.

1. *Romish Doctrine of Purgatory.*

The chief characteristics of the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, seem to me, that it is 1) a *state* of suffering, 2) of punishment.

Thus to take the statement of two authors living among us, one[p] says,

"Catholics hold there is a Purgatory, that is to say, a place or state where souls departing this life with remission of their sins, as to the guilt or eternal pain, but yet liable to some temporal punishment (of which I have just

[p] Dr. Butler, lect. 6. on Purgatory.

spoken) still remaining due, or not perfectly freed from the blemish of some defects, which we call venial sins, are purged before their admittance into Heaven, where nothing that is defiled can enter."

Dr. Wiseman[q],

"From this subject of satisfaction, I naturally proceed to the consideration of another topic, intimately connected with it, the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. The Catholic doctrine of satisfaction would be incomplete without it. The idea that God requires satisfaction, and will punish sin, would not go to its furthest and necessary consequence, if we did not believe that the sinner may be so punished in another world, as not to be wholly and eternally cast away from God."

In like way Bellarmine[r] says, the "true Catholic opinion" is that "Purgatory is only for those who die with venial faults, (1 Cor. iii.)—and again, for those who depart this life with punishment due (cum reatu pœnæ) their faults being already remitted."

These two statements seem to me its leading peculiarities; and, taken together, at once distinguish it from any thing found in the early Church. If any of the Fathers definitely hold that there will be suffering after this life, for some who shall be saved, it is not an abiding *state* of suffering; and again it is spoken of, solely with respect to the future, the purifying for the Presence of the All-holy God, not as a

[q] Lect. II. on Satisfaction and Purgatory, p. 52.

[r] De Purg. ii. 1.

"satisfaction" for past sin, which "God requires." These two combined points, then, sufficiently distinguish the Romish doctrine: add to this, that the three Fathers of the African Church, who may be thought most to approximate to the Romish doctrine, speak doubtingly; in the Romish Church it is an article of Faith, so that Cardinal Bellarmine says[s], that "whoso believeth not Purgatory, shall never arrive thither, but be tormented with everlasting burning in Hell."

It is, I should add, to me very questionable, whether these very Fathers do hold a doctrine bearing upon that of Rome: Tertullian[t] is speaking of sufferings of the soul without the body before the Day of Judgment, but has no hint that they who so suffer, will then be saved; rather he implies that a portion of the sufferings is paid then, without forestalling the full suffering, which is to follow, of "soul and body in hell;" and so the text (Matt. v. 25. Luke xii. 58.) is understood by S. Augustine in the same Church and by most fathers[u], of being "cast into a prison" from which

[r] iv. dist. 21. quoted also by Bonaventura, &c.

[s] De Purg. i. 11.

[t] "In short, seeing we understand that prison, which the Gospel points to, to be the 'place below' (inferos), and explain the last farthing, of every slight sin for which, in the interval before the resurrection, punishment is to be paid (luendum), no one will doubt that the soul pays somewhat in the place below, without forestalling the fulness of the resurrection through the flesh also." de anim. fin.

[u] S. Ambrose in Luc. S. Hil. in Matt. S. Aug. de Serm.

they should never come forth; as indeed who of men could "pay the very last farthing" due to God? (comp. Matt. xviii. 25, 34.) Again, even Romanist Theologians have thought that S. Cyprian[x] is speaking of sufferings in this life, and this, from the context, appears to me most probable. S. Augustine has distinct and opposite conjectures, evincing that he had not a definite *opinion* upon this subject; and even when[y], in opposing those who thought that all sins, however grievous, of baptized Christians who remained in the unity of the Church, would be remitted through temporal fire, he admits it to be a question, whether there be not such a fire, whereby lighter sins would be cleansed, the whole context leads one to think that he is speaking of privation of bliss and mental pain not of corporeal suffering. For he had, before, been speaking of the pains which they endured through temporal *losses*, who, holding

Dom. in Monte, l. i. §. 30. Theoph. ad Luc. S. Jerome in Matt. implies the same. Stapleton Antid. Ev. says, that few Catholics interpret it of Purgatory.

[x] "It is one thing to stand for pardon, another to arrive safe at glory; one to be sent to prison, there to remain till the last farthing be paid; another to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; one thing to be tormented for sin in long pain and so to be cleansed, and to be purged a long while in the fire, another to have washed away all sin in martyrdom; one thing, in short, to wait for the Lord's sentence in the day of judgment, another at once to be crowned by Him." Ep. 55. ad Antonian.

[y] Lib. ad Dulcit. q. i. §. 6—13. see the context more fully, Tract 79. p. 41. where his other conjectures are also given.

"the foundation," "built thereon wood, hay, stubble," i. e. temporal enjoyments, which yet they did not prefer to the "foundation," Christ; and that "through this pain of having to forego them they were saved as by fire." When then he goes on to say,

"Something of this sort, *it is not incredible*, may take place after this life also, and whether it be so, may be enquired, (whether it can be discovered or no;) that some believers, through a certain purgatorial fire, as they have more or less loved perishing goods, shall more slowly or speedily attain salvation;"

it seems to me certain, that he had in view a "pœna damni" only, corresponding to the sufferings from privation in this life of which he had just spoken; as his very words too, "shall more slowly or speedily attain salvation," seem to indicate what that privation was, viz. of the bliss of the Beatific Vision, such as, in the intermediate state, is vouchsafed to the saved.

To return, however, to the "Romish Doctrine." The points, which I have selected as characteristic of it, would,—nakedly as I have stated them,—give a very inadequate notion of the doctrine of Purgatory, as it was taught at the time of our Reformation. To fill up this outline, we must go back to the "doctrine of the Schoolmen[r]," to which our Articles originally referred.

[r] It seems strange that Dr. Wiseman, in his Letter to Mr. Newman, should not have known what Mr. N. meant by a

P. Lombard then changes into certainty the conjecture[s] of S. Augustine; and then he applies to the Roman *state* of suffering, words in which S. Augustine is speaking, according to the Greek view, of a fire at the Day of Judgment[t]. However, on the supposed authority of S. Augustine, it became a received maxim in the Schools, that the "fire" of purgatory "is more grievous than any thing that a man can suffer in this

term used commonly among Romanist writers also, the "doctrine of the Schools," namely, the Schoolmen, whose sayings formed "the received doctrine of the day." Dr. Wiseman's answer, appealing to what himself and other Divines *now* teach, is wholly beside the mark; the whole Letter consequently but leads away from the point at issue. One does not like to say what seems personal, but who will guarantee that Dr. Wiseman's teaching was accounted sound, or sufficiently "Roman?" Report certainly said otherwise, and spoke of doubts and misgivings felt in the highest quarters.

[s] In Ps. 37. §. 3. S. Aug. here as elsewhere, begins by owning that what he is going to say is but conjecture, "Et forte," "And perhaps."

[t] See Tract 79, p. 40. Bp. Montague (Answer to the late Gagger of Protestants, p. 288, 9.) points out the differences between S. Aug.'s view and the Roman; 1) S. Aug. calls it an "amending fire," (emendatorius). Romanists hold Purgatory to be penal only. 2) He places it at the Day of Judgment, when the Romish purgatory ceases. 3) Bp. M. quotes the "ordinary Gloss" as understanding S. Aug. of the Day of Judgment. It may be added that S. Aug. expresses the Greek view, in a passage corresponding to this, in the same work on the Psalms, (in Ps. vi. §. 3.) as also in another, (in Ps. 103. Serm. 3. §. 5. see Tract 79, p. 40, 41.) whereas in this work he no where even conjectures that the Purgatorial fire will be lasting.

life;" Aquinas[x], from Gregory the Great, affirms, that "the fire of purgatory and hell are the same," and also, from himself, as the only difference, "that the[y] damned, as being lower in merit, are to be ranked lower in place;" that "the[z] punishment is two-fold, one, of the loss of the Divine Vision (pœna damni), the other of suffering (pœna sensus), in that they will be punished with corporeal fire, and in either, the least punishment of purgatory is greater than the greatest of this life." Bonaventura says, "the doctors of our time commonly hold[a]," (as he does himself,) "that the purgatorial fire is corporeal or material," and "though S. Augustine seemed to doubt herein, other doctors remove all doubt from us," and he argues, at length, against the notion of a spiritual purgatory.

In any case, the pains were held to differ only in

[x] ib. ii. 3. Præt.

[y] ib. v. ad 2.

[z] ib. i. ad 3.

[a] This is affirmed also by Alex. Alens. iv. P. q. 15. art. 2. §. 2. Agazel. lib. phys. v. 4. ap. Rich. de Med. Vill. "since the fire which afflicteth souls in purgatory is more active than our fire, which yet is most afflictive of all elements," add Rich. himself iv. dist. 20. art. 2. q. 1. In Bonav. there are further quoted, Brulefer ib. q. 4. and Pet. de Tarantas. (afterwards Pope Innocent V.) ib. q. 3. Thom. Arg. ib. q. 1. art. 3. Less (in Thom. de Purg. c. i. dub. 2.) says, "It is *certain* that in Purgatory there is punishment of suffering [not of privation only]; that the punishment is by material fire is the common opinion of the Doctors, yet not matter of Faith."

duration from those of hell, (with regard to which the same question was raised whether the fire was material,) and hence it was argued that the fire was the same.

"Because[b] those souls suffer the same punishment as the damned, namely, the punishment of privation [of God's Presence] and suffering, and this differs only in that it is not eternal, as is the punishment of the damned, therefore it agreeth hereto, that they should suffer in the same place and by the same fire."

Bonaventura says further that souls remain there longer or shorter, as they remained longer or shorter in sin[c], and that

"The manifold authority of the saints establishes, that some, namely venial, sins may be remitted not in this world only, but also in purgatory, and since there is no room there for deserts or for sacraments, such punitive or purgatorial fire is called in aid, so called because the soul is purged from the dross of sin, and from venial faults, if it depart with them[d]."

Further, this state was considered capable of alle-

[b] Less. l. c.

[c] So also Alex. Alen. l. c. q. 3. In Bonaventura there are also quoted Richard. l. c. q. 2. Brulef. l. c. q. 5.

[d] "'Final grace effaces venial sin in the act of the dissolution of soul and body,' &c. This was said by those of old, but now *it is commonly held* that venial sin, being taken hence by many, is purged in purgatory as to the guilt also." Albert. M. comp. Theol. verit. iii. 13. quoted by Abp. Ussher, "of purgatory:" add also Alex. Alens. l. 3. memb. 3. art. 3. §. 5. In Bonav. are also quoted Rich. l. c. q. 1. Brulef. l. c. q. 3. Pet. de Tarantas. l. c. q. 1.

viation through indulgences; of which more presently. It is stated also as a probable opinion[e], that individuals remained in purgatory during centuries. Yet more, in order fully to realize what the writers of our Articles had in view, in condemning the "Roman doctrine" of purgatory, we ought to take into account the popular tales and representations circulated at that time, the pictures in which it was exhibited, the vivid descriptions given of it, the detailed visions in which it was said to have been revealed; the lengthened period of thousands of years, during which it must be supposed to last, since the indulgences remitted thousands of years of suffering. And on this ground alone, it must practically have effaced the thought of Hell in the minds of the people, since so long temporal punishment will in itself fill the mind, and leave no room for the thought of any thing beyond it.

The above abstract statements, however, though they give no idea of the *practical* character of the doctrine, suffice to explain what the Article means by the "Romish doctrine of Purgatory;" according to which it was "a lengthened *state* of actual suffering, as well as of privation of the Divine Vision, without rest day or night[f], through real fire, and

[e] Less ad S. Thomam de Purg. c. 2. dub. 4. "pains, which else [i. e. unless daily masses were purchased], will hold them here with us in fire and torments intolerable, only God knoweth how long." Sir Thos. More, Supplication of Souls, Works, p. 316.

[f] "We—not yet importunately bereave you of your rest, with

that the fire of Hell, not only purifying the soul for the Divine Presence, but also satisfying the Divine Justice, exacting the punishment of sin, which, at departure from this life, remained unpaid, yet capable of mitigation through the treasure of merits at the disposal of the Pope."

Such then being the "Roman doctrine," it follows, of course, that a doctrine differing in kind from this, is not the doctrine contemplated, one way or other, in the Articles. The supposition of a pœna damni, that those who were not "pure in heart" might not for a long period be admitted to "see God," and that this privation might itself be purifying; that the whole period between the departure from the body and the Resurrection may be one of painless purifying of the soul, in order that it may be capable (in S. Irenæus' words) to "receive God;" that persons may, by some sorts of sin, forfeit the fulness of the Presence of Christ in the intermediate state; that, though with a cheering hope, they may not be certain of their salvation, any more than in this life they are; and that under any of these circumstances, it may please God to give to such souls a larger portion of comfort and joy, through the prayers and oblations of the Church,—any of these suppositions are quite distinct from the Roman doctrine, which maintains "a temporary period of actual *suffering*."

crying at your ears, at unseasonable times, when ye would (*which we do never*) repose yourselves and take ease." Sir Thos. More, l. c. p. 288. See, at length, Tract 81, p. 9.

On the other hand, the view found in Origen, S. Ambrose, S. Hilary, S. Jerome, S. Paulinus of Nola, S. Basil, and S. Gregory of Nazianzum, that "fors all but the highest saints in whom love dissolved all remaining dross whatsoever, some transient suffering, more or less in duration, was in store at the Day of Judgment," though it has the notion of "suffering," differs from the Romish, as to the time when it takes place, and that it is not a *state* of suffering; nor again does it stand in any relation to the prayers of the Church. This view is accordingly condemned by Romanist writers as inadequate or erroneous[h], who thus again confirm the view, (if any such confirmation were needed,) that such is not the doctrine condemned by our Articles as the "Roman doctrine."

Our Article does not then condemn all notion of a purifying process after this life, but one distinct system; and our Church has evidently taken the more humble line, not presuming to affirm or deny what has not been revealed, but denying the only view of Purgatory contrary to Holy Scripture, which for our consolation declares our departed to be at "rest," whereas this exhibits them in intense suffering. If any collect from the impression of Antiquity, a general awe of what may pass between death and Judgment, it may be that he will acquire more reverent thoughts of the exceed-

[g] Tract 79 on Purgatory, p. 35.

[h] Bellarm. de Purg. ii. 1. quoted Tract 79, p. 26.

ing holiness of God's Presence, and reflect more earnestly as to the fruits of actions or courses of action, and learn to speak less peremptorily, one way or the other, when Holy Scripture is silent; but our Article leaves him free, so long as he maintain not that one doctrine which is "repugnant to the word of God."

In conclusion, since people are disposed to believe all things, which are said hardly of what they dislike, I may just observe, that neither in my own writings, nor in those of any of my friends, is there any trace of a tenet, which it has lately been affirmed [g] that we are "zealous in teaching," "that there is a Purgatory for the purification of the saints," nor do I hold it. Our friend, as you know, has put it prominently forward as one of the chief points of our controversy with Rome [h].

2. *Romish Doctrine of Pardons.*

Our Article joins on the "Romish doctrine of Pardons" or "Indulgences" [indulgentiis] immediately to that of "Purgatory," thereby the more shewing what it was which it meant to condemn, the assumed power, namely, of the Pope to lessen by Indulgences the period of Purgatorial suffering.

[g] Edinburgh Review, No. 147. p. 272.

[h] Tract 79, and Lectures on Romanism.

This is illustrated by the citations of Bp. Jewel[i], shewing that "Pardons sprung out of Purgatory."

"Roffensis saith (contr. Lutherum. Polydor. de Inventor. l. 8. c. 1.) 'Thus Jansene: It cannot well appear from whom Pardons first began. Among the old Doctors and Fathers of the Church, there was either no talk at all, or very little talk of Purgatory. But as long as Purgatory was not cared for, there was no man that sought for Pardons. For the whole price of Pardons hangeth of Purgatory. Take away Purgatory, and what shall we need of Pardons? Pardons began, when folk were a little feared with the pains of Purgatory."

"Johannes Major saith (in 4. Sent. Dist. 20. Quæst. 2.): 'Of Pardons little may be said of certainty: for the Scripture expressly saith nothing of them. Touching that Christ saith unto Peter, Unto thee will I give the keys, &c. we must understand this authority with a corn of salt,' (otherwise it may be unsavory.) 'Therefore certain' of the Pope's 'Pardons that promise twenty thousand years are foolish and superstitious[k].'

[i] Defence of Apol. c. 7. dis. 1. p. 486.

[k] The authenticity of these pardons has been disputed in modern times; Bouvier, however, defends the principle on which they rest; "it may happen that such indulgences would not be equal to a Plenary Indulgence. For let us suppose a sinner who [sin which] merited 10 years of Canonical penance; let us also suppose a man who lived 20 or 30 years in the habit of frequently committing sin by thought, by desire, and by action, which is not uncommon; in the language of the Prophet, he will have multiplied his sins beyond the hairs of his head; each in particular will not merit less punishment than if it had been committed only once; how great therefore would be the time of Canonical penance which this sinner should perform in order to comply with the Church discipline? It is incalculable; and even, in this case, it is probable it would be far from satisfying

"Your School Doctors themselves (Veselus) are wont sometime to say, 'The devising of Pardons is a godly guile, and a hurtless deceit; to the intent that by a devout kind of error the people may be drawne to godliness.'

"Here Mr. Harding, you see the Antiquitie, Authoritie, and best countenance of your Pardons: that they flowed first out of the sinks of your Purgatory, as one vanity floweth out of another: you see that your Pardons sometimes may be 'superstitious,' and full of 'folly:' you see that the sale of your Pardons is 'a godly guile,' and a devout kinde of error to lead the people."—

"Alphonsus de Castro saith (Lib. 8. Indulgentiæ): 'There is nothing that the Scriptures have less opened, or whereof the old learned Fathers have less written, than of Pardons. Of Pardons (in the Scriptures and Doctors) there is no mention.'"

God's justice, since we are ignorant of the proportion between the Canonical penance, and the diminution of the pains of the next life. However, we hold that a Plenary Indulgence, perfectly gained, would cancel this immense debt in all its extent! Therefore we ought not to condemn Partial Indulgences for being too long, provided they are well authenticated; otherwise we should condemn Plenary Indulgences[1]." In fact, also, the manifold Indulgences given to the members of religious fraternities in the Romish Church would soon make up this sum. Thus to the members of the "pious sodality of the most sacred heart" of our Lord, indulgences are given annually of above 1600 years [1616 years and as many quarantines or periods of 40 days] besides 29 Plenary Indulgences; to which are added 12 more, Plenary, for the daily recitation of the Rosary, besides other lesser ones, as 300 days for every contrite repetition of the Rosary, and 60 days for every good work devoutly performed. ("The pious sodality, &c. 8th edit. with the approbation of the most Rev. Dr. Murray, &c.")

[1] Taken from "A dogmatical and practical treatise on Indulgences," abridged from Bouvier's Work, Dublin, 1839.

Cardinal Fisher also says [l],

"It weighs perhaps with many, that we lay such stress upon Indulgences, which are apparently of but recent usage in the Church, not being found among Christians, till a very late date."

It is clear, then, from this, that nothing which existed in the Primitive Church was contemplated by our Articles, as of course the doctrine of Absolution could not be, which, in its strongest form, our Church recognizes in the "Order for the Visitation of the sick." It condemns a doctrine, consequent upon the "Romish doctrine of Purgatory," and therefore, as well as that doctrine, unknown to the early centuries. The "godly discipline" of the Primitive Church, our own, in her yearly humiliation, professes her desire to restore, though as yet unable. But indeed the very term "pardons" or "indulgences" is notoriously a technical term for one specific doctrine connected with absolution, and does not relate to absolution itself, from which it is separated, as treated of by the Schoolmen. Thus Thomas Aquinas gives us a summary of P. Lombard's teaching on this head [m];

"*After* the 'master' had laid down as to penance and the power of the ministry, to whom the dispensation of this sacrament belongs, he here lays down some things, which follow upon penance, in two parts. In the first he lays

[l] Assert. Luth. conf. 18. quoted Tract 79, p. 50.

[m] In P. 4. dist. 20.

down the time of penance; in the second some things which relate to the defect of penance. The first falls into two heads; it shews 1) that the time of penance is to the end of life; 2) how they are to be dealt with, who repent at the end; and this is two-fold. He shews 1) how they who repent at the end of life, obtain remission of sins, although they are still debtors as to the temporal punishment, which they will endure in purgatory after death; 2) that the same punishment is owing to those, who in whatever way do not complete worthy satisfaction in this life, &c.'

Aquinas himself proposes his questions under the following heads[l];

"1) whether any one can by repentance at the end of his life obtain pardon of sins; 2) whether the temporal punishment, the charge whereof remains after penitence, be estimated according to the amount of the fault; 3) whether any of the punishment, whereby satisfaction is made, can be remitted by indulgences; 4) whether any parochial priest can give an indulgence; 5) whether an indulgence avail to one in mortal sin."

"Indulgence" itself is thus defined[m]; "remission of temporal punishment, due to God for actual sin, given by the authority of the Church, exterior to the Sacrament, by the application of those satisfactions, which are laid up in the common treasure of the Church."

And the "temporal punishment" so spoken of not only includes the sufferings of Purgatory, but

[l] ib. q. 1. art. 1—5.

[m] Less. ad Thom. Aq. de Indulgent.

the chief character of Indulgences must necessarily be derived from it. The doctrine of Purgatory alone gives these their interest and importance. So long indeed as the shortening of the term of penance brought with it restoration to the communion of the Church, and in it to the participation of that Body and Blood, whereby we are cemented into the mystical Body of Christ, it was of course a great privilege; such it was in the practice of the early Church on which Romanists profess their "indulgences" to be founded [n]; the intercession of the martyrs, (although even it was abused [o] to "heal slightly" a grievous "wound,") in obtaining for the lapsed re-admission to the Holy Communion, did obtain for them inestimable privileges: again, an earlier reconciliation in the case of the dying was indeed a mercy, when in their extremities

[n] Dr. Wiseman, Lect. 12. on Indulgences, t. ii. p. 79. "The chief ground of indulgence or mitigation, and the one which most exactly includes all the principles of a modern indulgence, was the earliest, perhaps, admitted in the Church. When the martyrs, or those who were on the point of receiving the crown and had already attested their love of Christ by suffering, were confined in prison, those unfortunate Christians who had fallen [i. e. had abjured Christ under Heathen tortures] and were condemned to penance, had recourse to their mediation; and upon returning to the pastors of the Church with a written recommendation to mercy from one of those chosen servants of God and witnesses of Christ, were received at once to reconciliation, and absolved from the remainder of their penance."

[o] S. Cyprian complains of the practice in most of his letters on "the lapsed."

and last conflict it obtained for them the restoration of the "pledges of" their Saviour's "love," and placed them in Communion with Him: or, again, when in the prospect of persecution, they who had once denied the faith, were restored to Communion, in the hope that they might overcome wherein they had been overcome, this also was a great privilege that they were not left to such a conflict "unarmed, but were fortified with the protection of the Blood and the Body of Christ [p]." But when Communion came to be previously restored, and Indulgences were only "relaxations of temporal punishment," what great worth would they have, if confined to this life? Were they, as modern Romanists exhibit them [q], only a mitigation of penance enjoined by the Church, what great interest would they have? The wounded spirit would rather dread them than long for them; the true penitent would rather dread to be released entirely from the discipline and chastening, which are the correction and remedy of his former sins; he takes cheerfully the chastenings of God's own hand; he accepts gladly the austerities or priva-

[p] S. Cyprian, Ep. 57. (Fell) mentions both these cases: Dr. Wiseman, l. c. gives these as instances of early "indulgences."

[q] Thus Dr. Wiseman, l. c. drops all allusion to Purgatory. Dr. Butler only alludes to any thing, *not* in this life, thus slightly; "this atonement, *if considered in this life*, consists either in the penitential works prescribed in the canons, or imposed by the confessor." Lect. 5. "Objections against the several parts of the Sacrament of Penance."

tions or self-denials, which may tend to deepen his repentance and approve its sincerity. To what end to be free from a wholesome though bitter medicine? The history of ascetics of all times shews, that earnest repentance craves no "indulgences;" men's own experience will tell them, that a discipline in conformity with their sin is joyous as well as healthful. But when the doctrine of "satisfaction," instead of being the expression and means of contrition, became the discharge of a definite debt to Almighty God, and this debt, if not discharged or released in this life, was thought to be still due after death, and paid by the sufferings of purging fire, and that, the fire of hell, though for a time only, then indeed any relaxation of the "temporal punishment" did acquire an exceeding value, not for the sake of any thing in this life, but to shorten those extreme and unknown sufferings, which were believed to be greater than any thing in this life; which were intense as Hell; from which there was no rest day nor night; and to whose duration there was no certain limit, but the Day of Judgment. Any limitation of canonical penance shrinks into absolute insignificance, if not rather to be deprecated than to be purchased.

It is indeed remarkable, that Romanists admit that "Indulgences" do not supersede "penance," thereby shewing that "canonical penance," which they state to have been the object of that "mitigation which *most exactly* includes all the principles

of a modern indulgence[a]" is not the object of *their* "indulgences;" and they urge the continuance of "penance," even after obtaining "indulgences," on the very ground that the real end of both is not any thing in this life, but so to compensate to Divine Justice that the penitents be not after this life cast into Purgatory[b]. Purgatory then is the real end of the modern system of "indulgences" and "penance:" of "penance," in the Ancient Church, the end was, to escape Hell by furthering such repentance as made the sinner capable of God's mercies in Christ; the relaxations which Romanists parallel with their "indulgences," were restoration to the communion of the Church.

[b] Dr. Wiseman, see p. 95. n. n. "Indulgences of a hundred years or more, if there are such, may be insufficient to compensate the whole temporal punishment which a sinner is bound to pay . . Hence, thirdly, sinners truly converted ought to endeavour daily by good works [satisfactions] and indulgences, whether partial or plenary, to diminish the debts which they owe to Divine Justice and to compensate for them entirely in this life, lest they be sent to the prisons of purgatory, and do not come out thence till they have paid the last farthing." Bouvier de Pœnit. p. 301, quoted by Mr. Palmer, 3rd Letter to Dr. Wiseman, p. 7. "We do not believe an indulgence to imply any exemption from repentance . . . . . nor from the works of penance or other good works, because our Church teaches, that 'the life of a Christian ought to be a perpetual penance.' (Conc. Trid. de extr. Unct.) No one can ever be sure that he has gained the entire benefit of an indulgence, though he has performed all the conditions appointed for this end." Dr. Milner End of Controversy, Lett. 42, p. 304. 306. quoted ib.

"Pardons" then are altogether distinct from "pardon" through the power of the keys, because absolution relates to guilt, "pardons" to punishment; absolution is spiritual, "pardons" outward only; absolution, in whatever degree, alters a sinner's state towards God, "pardons" remit only a penalty due after restoration to God's favour; absolution restores to Communion, and opens the soul to the grace of the Sacrament, "pardons" follow upon restoration; absolution applies the power of the keys by virtue of Christ's authority committed to His ministers, "pardons," a certain treasure made up of the merits of Christ and of works of supererogation of His saints, supposed to be committed to the keeping of the Church; absolution applies God's mercy through the Satisfaction of His Son, "pardons" relate to a "satisfaction" still due from man to God; "pardons" are applied directly to the state of the soul after death, absolution only relates to it, in as far as it changes that state in this life; "pardons" presuppose absolution, absolution does not involve any doctrine of "pardons." Their provinces, offices, ends, comforts, value, are not less distinct than their scripturalness and primitiveness, absolution being derived from the distinct promise of our Lord, as understood by the Primitive and Catholic Church, "pardons" are founded on a precarious extension of the fact, of which Scripture also gives instances, that God does not always, with the guilt, remit the

punishment of sin, but which it neither declares to be His uniform rule, nor did His Church in her purer days believe that she had received from Him any influence in its suspension. Rather, the infliction or continuance of punishment, even after aggravated sin has been repented of, seems to have so important a place in the Divine government, and (it may be) to be so connected with the Divine Attributes, as not to admit of any interference. We see continually instances of it; in many cases, it is annexed by a regular law, so that sin, persisted in to a certain point, entails punishment by a natural consequence, i. e. by certain effects resulting from the sin according to a fixed rule and brought about by it; we do *not* see that when so annexed, it is ever remitted. The very Intercession of our Lord, which obtains the restoration of the offender to God's favour, is not, as far as we see, applied to it. It may be required, as I said, by the Moral Government of God or His Attributes, in some way we know not, that one who has sinned to a certain point, should remain under punishment in this life; it *may be*, that it is essential to such continued penitence as may be necessary for him; beyond this, we know nothing; it is a fact which we see and know in God's dealings with men, not a truth of Revelation. The Romanists have erred in assuming, 1) that it is uniform, 2) that it is a "satisfaction" to God's justice, 3) that it is a definite debt, which must be paid, and so if not

paid in this life, is to be paid in Purgatory, 4) that the Church can interfere with it.

This, however, is the sole province of "Indulgences." They take up the offender, where absolution leaves him, and are a supplement to it. Absolution frees him from guilt, leaves him (according to Romanists) with a debt upon him to Almighty God. This debt it is the office of Indulgences to abate or extinguish.

The Schoolmen, accordingly, rightly deny that Indulgences are a mere relaxation of Ecclesiastical penance[o],—or that they depend "simply on the power of the keys, (in which case they could have been given by Priests,) whereas they require, over and above, jurisdiction and the power of dispensing the Church's treasure, which ordinarily belongs to Bishops alone, as being the husbands of the Church, and so having the disposal of that dowry which she had from her betrothing to Christ[p]." Again, it is distinctly stated[q], that they "release not from guilt (which is the power of the keys), but from punishment."

The connection of "Indulgences" with Purgatory, which Romanists among ourselves now suppress, is thus asserted by the Schoolmen.

"It[r] is most truly assumed, that the treasure of the

[o] Bonav. iv. Dist. 20. q. 2.

[p] ib. q. 3.

[q] ib. q. 4.

[r] Alex. Alens. 4. q. 24. Memb. 5. add Bonavent. iv. Dist. 20.

Church is in the power of the Pope, and that he can communicate its benefits to them, (since on account of the charity wherein they departed they are fit objects to receive the benefits of the Church,) and thus he can grant them indulgences and relaxations."

"As by God[s] eternal punishment is changed into purgatorial, so by the priests purgatorial punishment into temporal."

"That[t] Indulgences profit the departed, who are detained in Purgatory, if applied to them by the Church, is certain, and the contrary is a heresy, or most close upon a heresy."

Only the mode of application differs, it being generally ruled, that since the departed are removed out of the jurisdiction of the Church into that of God, the Pope can no longer bestow these Indulgences as a judicial act, but only in the way of obtaining the relaxation from God.

"The relaxation[u] may take place by the way of suffrage or impetration, and not by that of judicial absolution or commutation."

"Those[x] who are in Purgatory, Indulgences profit not directly, yet indirectly they do profit them."

Even this, however, is matter of doubt among them. Ricardus de Media Villa, in citing a form of

c. 5. who quotes also S. Thom. Suppl. 3. p. q. 27. art. 1. Brulef. iv. Dist. 20. q. 8. Pet. de Tarantas. ib. q. 22. Ric. de Med. Villa, ib. art. 3. q. 3.

[s] Al. Alens. ib. memb. 3.

[t] Less. in S. Thomam de Indulg. c. 5.

[u] Alex. Alens. l. c.

[x] Ric. de Med. Vill. l. c.

indulgence given for one departed, says, that this is the opinion of "some" only.

"Whoever[y] shall do this or that for himself or for his departed father, or for any other person, being in Purgatory, we give so many days' indulgence, but so, *according to some*, they do not profit them, except in the way of suffrage."

"It is the common opinion[z], that Indulgences are only bestowed by the way of compensation or of suffrage."

The extent to which they were carried is singularly illustrated by the question, discussed by the Schoolmen generally, "whether Indulgences avail as much as they promise"—so large were they, that it was argued, that "since merits were now so few, that a person could scarcely suffice for himself, the Church's treasure must have been long exhausted[a];" so vague, that they promised for the same act, (whether it cost much to the individual or no,) the same relaxation, as of "the third part of his penance[b]," whether it were ten or thirty years. Their moral effect is illustrated by the question, "whether if one in the prospect of the plenary remission of a jubilee committed more grievous

[y] l. c.

[z] Less. l. c.

[a] Bonav. iv. Dist. 20. q. 6. where there are quoted Alex. Alens. iv. p. q. 23. Memb. 2. S. Tho. in suppl. 3. p. q. 25. art. 1. Richard. iv. Sent. dist. 20. art. 3. q. 2. Brulef. ib. q. 9. Pet. de Tarant. ib. q. 22.

[b] Bonav. ib.

sin, (reserved cases) he would derive the benefits of it?" This is affirmed to be the most probable[c].

There is then ample proof that the doctrine and practice condemned in the Article is (as our friend stated) " not every doctrine about pardons, but a certain doctrine, the Romish doctrine, as indeed the plural form itself shews," and this as he further states, " the doctrine maintained and acted on in the Roman Church, that remission of the *penalties* of sin in the next life may be obtained by the power of the Pope, with such abuses as money payments consequent thereupon[d]."

3. *Invocation of Saints.*

The distinctions between the " Romish doctrine of Invocation of Saints" and any practice which may be found in the early Church, (although itself also not primitive or Catholic, but rather the vent of individual feeling,) have been so clearly and fully pointed out by an unsuspected authority, Archbishop Ussher, that one need but have referred to his work. It is one thing, however, to acknowledge a thing, another to have it vividly before our

[c] Less. ad Aq. cap. de Indulg. fin.

[d] This in Ed. 1. stood, "large and reckless indulgences from the penalties of sin obtained on money payments." In either case, the distinctive character of the doctrine was pointed out, an assumed release from the *penalties* of sin.

eyes; and it is of so much moment to us on all sides, as well as to the Roman Church, to have a distinct perception of the difference between the early and the later practice, that I will set down the heads of Archbishop Ussher's contrasts, and at length subjoin the specimens which he gives of the later practice; painful as is the exhibition of so much that is shocking in the devotions of a Christian Church. The differences then noted by Archbishop Ussher are these: 1) that in the Ancient Church, mental addresses were confined to God, as knowing the thoughts; in the Romish, are made to the saints also. 2) In the Ancient Church, they spoke doubtfully, whether the Saints know the details of our wants; in the Romish, it is held as a point of faith that they hear men's prayers. 3) In the Ancient, the Saints were applied to only in the same way as the living; in the Romish, "formal and absolute prayers are tendered to them." 4) In the Ancient, they are addressed only as joint petitioners; in the Romish, as advocates and mediators by virtue of their own merits also. 5) In the Ancient, the seeking the prayers of the Saints interfered not with our "boldness to approach the throne of grace;" in the Romish, the Saints are held out as an easier and more acceptable way for a sinner to approach to God. 6) In the Ancient, persons were taught chiefly to look to their own prayers; in the Romish, to the intercession of Saints.

7) " And principally," in the Ancient Church, the prayers of the Saints were requested as fellow-servants; in the Romish, " invocation is attributed as a part of the worship due to them, in Bellarmine's words ' an eminent kind of adoration.' "

These are mostly so many several ways of exhibiting how the ancient compellations of the Saints had no tendency to efface the thought of the " One God and the One Mediator between God and man," or to stop short in them; which is miserably the tendency of much, encouraged by the Roman practice. In the Ancient Church, no service was asked of them, which might not be also rendered conjointly by our brethren on earth, nothing asked different in kind, nothing said which could even *seem* to centre in them; they are not avenues of approaching to God, but, as part of the Church, joint intercessors with the members who are in the flesh; nor, in asking their prayers, is *any office or service to them contemplated.* In forms, on the contrary, used in the Church of Rome, the Saints are (as far as the words go) asked absolutely to render offices, which are in the power of God only; if these prayers can be explained in any other sense, this is not their obvious meaning; the words do not lead up to God, but in themselves rather lead away from Him, by resting in the creature; they ask of St. Mary and of the Saints to " loose, heal, give life, &c." and do not suggest that they cannot do this by any power

entrusted to them, much less by any virtue of their own; the Saints are proposed for the time as the objects in which devotion is to centre; and, if it be possible that some can use such prayers in a sound sense, still their tendency, and their actual effect upon the multitude, is to bind them down to the Saints, in whom the language terminates; and this the more, since devotion to the Saints is on principle encouraged.

This last point, which Archbishop Ussher gives as a "principal" difference between the prayers of the Ancient and Romish Church, is of the more moment practically, because the same act will have a very different character, according to the frame of mind in which it is performed. Could Romanists shew ever so much (which they can not) that the direct forms "help me, heal me,") much less "do thou give heaven, remit sin,") were used in the Ancient Church, in insulated cases[c], this would

[c] To take the only case in Antiquity of any account, (for the rest alleged by Dr. Wiseman in his recent "Remarks" are either spurious or nothing to the purpose,) the virgin Justina mentioned by S. Gregory. All which can be collected from it is, that having prayed at much length to The Father and our Lord, she in some way "besought the *Virgin* Mary to aid a *virgin* in danger:" we have not the words she used; those of S. Gregory from the very antithesis are evidently oratorical; they do not imply that she said in the modern Roman way "help me." She may only have asked her prayers; this quite satisfies the language, and since we do not find the other form in those times, it is probable that she did no more. S. Gregory's relation is; "Abandoning all other hope, she flees to God for refuge.

not bear out the modern Romish practice, in which they are systematically a part of devotion. An address to a saint, as the result of a momentary feeling, is very different from habitual prayers to them, *as devotion.* The one tends to substitute them in the place of God, the other does not. The one proposes them as an object of "worship, adoration," or whatever it may be called; the other does not. It matters not whether in the abstract it be called latreia or douleia; that which makes the modern prayers to the Saints so sore an evil, is that these prayers are recommended as devotion; the mind of the worshipper is directed to the Saints; the prayers offered to them, in their obvious sense terminate in them; it must require a strong effort of mind and much fixedness on God, to supply another sense than what is the obvious meaning of the words; and few who have observed their own habits of mind in prayer will think that such forms as "do thou give heaven, do thou loose, do thou heal, do thou remit sin, lead, conduct thou to glory, preserve thou, help thou, take away [sin], give life," addressed to a creature, are not

and takes as her defender, against that accursed passion, Him to Whom she was betrothed." Then having given specimens of her prayers to our Lord, he adds, "Having uttered these things, and *much beside*, and beseeching the Virgin Mary to aid a virgin in danger," &c. (τὴν παρθένον Μαρίαν ἱκετεύουσα βοηθῆσαι παρθένῳ κινδυνευούσῃ.) S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 24. §. 10. 11. How different this in tone from the sad extracts in Archbishop Ussher. On other authorities quoted by Romanists, see below, p. 115. note.

a grievous snare, that they do not tempt people to idolatry, and must not, too probably, for the most part, end in it.

It is not our office to judge the Church of Rome, though it is an act of charity to her to warn her what a grievous scandal these things are, even in our eyes as men, and to remind her of the woe denounced on those "who offend one of these little ones who believe in" Christ, if so be she may have grace given her at last, herself formally to condemn what, although she has never formally sanctioned, yet still she has encouraged. Meanwhile for our immediate purpose, it appears from this, that there is a "Romish doctrine of Invocation of Saints" wholly distinct from any thing in the Church of the 4th Century, holding them out as mediators preferable to our Lord, commending devotion to them as a religious act, asking them not merely to "pray for us," but to give us what we pray for. There is then, on this ground, no reason to think that our Article in condemning "the Romish doctrine," or "the doctrine of the Schoolmen," on this point, had any reference to any thing found in the early Church, being wholly distinct from it. The painful evidence given by Archbishop Ussher of this sad declension of the Roman Church, is so detailed and so long, that it must be kept for another place[d].

This same distinction between the Romish Invocation of Saints and the earlier occasional addresses

[d] Note A. at the end.

to them is also thus clearly drawn out in a valuable and full statement by Thorndike[e].

"I will distinguish three sorts of prayers to Saints, whether taught or allowed to be taught in the Church of Rome. The first is of those that are made to God, but to desire His blessings by and through the merits and intercession of His Saints. I cannot give so fit an example, as out of the Canon of the Mass, which all the Western Churches of that Communion do now use. There it is said, 'Communicating in and reverencing the memory of such and such of all Thy Saints, by whose merit and prayer grant that in all things we may be guarded by Thy protection and help.' There is also a short prayer for the Priest to say, when he comes to the altar, as he finds opportunity, 'We pray Thee, Lord, by the merits of the Saints, whose reliques are here, and all Saints; that thou wouldest vouchsafe to release me all my sins.' And on the first Sunday in Advent mentioning the Blessed Virgin, they pray, 'That we who believe her truly the Mother of God, may be helped by her intercession with Thee.'"

"The second is that which their Litanies contain.—The form of them is manifest, that whereas you have in them sometimes, 'Lord, have mercy upon us,' 'Christ, have mercy upon us,' 'Holy Trinity, One God, have mercy upon us;' you have much oftener the Blessed Virgin repeated again and again, under a number of her attributes; you have also all the Saints and Angels, or such as the present occasion pretends for the object of the devotion which a man tenders, named and spoken to, with, 'Ora pro nobis,' i. e. Pray for us. The Blessed Virgin some say with 'Te rogamus audi nos,' We beseech thee to hear us. One thing I must not forget to observe, that the prayers, which follow these Litanies, are almost

[e] Epilogue, b. iii. p. 356 sqq.

all of the first kind; that is to say, addressed directly to God, but mentioning the intercession of Saints or Angels for the means to obtain our prayers at His hands.

"The third is when they desire immediately of them the same blessings, spiritual and temporal, which all Christians desire of God. There is a Psalter to be seen, with the name of God changed every where into the name of the Blessed Virgin. There is a book of devotion in French with this title; 'Moyen de bien servir, prier, et adorer la Vierge Marie,' The way well to serve, pray to, and adore the Blessed Virgin. There are divers forms of prayer as well as private speeches, concerning her especially and other Saints, quoted in the Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, p. 303—345. Of those then, the first kind seem to me utterly agreeable with Christianity, importing only the exercise of that Communion which all members of God's Church hold with all members of it, ordained by God, for the means to obtain for one another the grace which the obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ hath purchased for us without difference, whether dead or alive; because, we stand assured that they have the same affection for us, dead or alive; so far as they know us and our estate, and are obliged to desire and esteem their prayers for us, as for all the members of Christ's mystical body. Neither is it in reason conceivable that all Christians from the beginning should make them the occasion of their devotions as I said, out of any consideration but this. For, as concerning the term 'merit' perpetually frequent in those prayers, it hath been always maintained by those of the Reformation that it is not used by the Latin Fathers, in any other sense than that which they allow. Therefore the Canon of the Mass and probably other prayers which are still in use, being more ancient than the greatest part of the Latin Fathers, there is no reason to make any difficulty of admitting it in that sense, the ground whereof I have maintained in the second book.

"The third, taking them at the foot of the letter, and valuing the intent of those that use them by nothing but the words of them, are mere idolatries; as desiring of the creature that which God only gives, which is the worship of the creature for the Creator, 'God blessed for evermore.' And, were we bound to make the acts of them that teach these prayers the acts of the Church, because it tolerates them and maintains them in it, instead of casting them out, it would be hard to free that Church from idolatry; which whoso admitteth, can by no means grant it to be a Church, the being whereof supposeth the worship of One God, exclusive to any thing else. But the words of them are capable of the same limitation that I gave to the words of our Lord when I said, that they whom Christians do good to here, may be said to receive them into everlasting habitations, because God does it in consideration of them, and of the good done them. And so when Irenæus calls the Virgin Mary the advocate of Eve, (v. 19.) he that considers his words there and iii. 33. shall find that he saith it, not because she prayed for him, but because she believed the Angel's message, and submitted to God's will, and so became the means of saving all, though by our Lord Christ, Who pleadeth even for her as well as Eve. Ground enough there is for such a construction; even the belief of One God alone, that stands at the head of our Creed, which we have no reason to think the Church allows them secretly to renounce, whom she alloweth to make these prayers. And therefore no ground to construe them so, as if the Church, by allowing them, did renounce the ground of all her Christianity. *But not ground enough to satisfy a reasonable man, that all that make them do hold that infinite distance between God and His Saints and Angels, of whom they demand the same effects, which if they hold not, they are idolaters as the Heathen were:* who being convinced of one Godhead, as the Fathers challenge to their faces, divided it into one prin-

cipal, and divers that by His gift are such. *How shall I presume, that simple Christians, in the devotions of their hearts, understand that distance of God from His creatures which their words signify not? which the wisest of their teachers will be much troubled to say, by what figure of speech they can allow it?* Especially if it be considered how little reason or interest in religion there can be to advance this reverence of Christian people towards the Saints or Angels so far above the reason and ground, which ought to be the spring-head of it. For so far are we from any tradition of the Catholic Church for this, that the admonition of Epiphanius to the Collyridians takes hold of it.—So doth the admonition of S. Ambrose[a] (in Rom. i.) to them who reserve nothing to God, that they give not to His servants. So doth that of S. Augustine, (de Vera Rel. cap. lv.) that our religion is not to consist in worshipping the dead; and that an Angel forbad S. John to worship him, but only God; Whose fellow-servants they were. So doth the argument of S. Gregory Nyssene, (contra Eunom. iv.) and Athanasius, (contra Arian. iii.) concluding our Lord to be God, because He is worshipped, which Cornelius was forbid by S. Peter, S. John by the the Angel, to do to them, saith Athanasius.

"In fine, so dangerous is the case, that whoso communicateth in it, is no way reasonably assured that he communicateth not in the worship of Idols. Only the Church of England having acknowledged the Church of Rome a true Church, though corrupt, ever since the Reformation, I am obliged so to interpret the prayers thereof, as to acknowledge the corruption so great, that the prayers which it alloweth, may be idolatries, if they be made in that sense which they may properly signify: but not that they are necessarily idolatries. For if they were necessarily idolatries, then were the Church of Rome necessarily no Church; the being of Christianity presupposing the wor-

[a] Ambrosiaster.

ship of One true God. And though, to confute the Heretics, the style of modern devotions leaves nothing to God, which is not attributed to and desired of His Saints; yet it cannot be denied they may be the words of them who believe that God alone can give that which they desire.

"The second sort, it is confessed, had the beginning in the flourishing times of the Church after Constantine [m]. The lights of the Greek and Latin Church, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyrils both, Theodoret, Fulgentius, Gregory the Great, Leo, more or rather all after that time, have all of them spoken to the Saints departed, and desired their assistance. But neither is this enough to make a tradition of the Church. For the Church had been three hundred years before it began. Irenæus is mistaken, when he is alleged for it, as I said even now. Card. Bellarmine alleges out of Eusebius de Preparat. xiii. 10. 'We make our prayers to them.' But the Greek bears only, 'We make our prayers to God at their monuments.' Athanasius de Sanctissima Deipara, whom he quotes, is certainly of a later date than Athanasius [n]. Out of S.

[m] Dr. Butler, (Lect. 12. p. 307.) alleging this passage, omits Thorndike's statement that this practice began in the times of Constantine, and quotes the rest thus, "It is confessed, adds the learned and impartial Thorndike, that *all* the Fathers both of the Greek and Latin Churches, &c." to "assistance."

[n] Still quoted by Dr. Wiseman thus, "S. Athanasius, the most zealous and strenuous supporter, that the Church ever possessed, of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and consequently of His infinite superiority over all the saints, thus enthusiastically addresses His ever-blessed Mother," (Lect. 13. p. 108.) yet the very edition from which he professes to quote, the Benedictine, pronounces the work spurious. It is quoted also by Dr. Butler, Lect. 3. "The singular devotion of the Catholic Church to the Blessed Virgin Mary justified." p. 103. On the same subject

Hilary I see nothing brought nor remember any thing to be brought to that purpose. In fine, after Constantine, when the Festivals of the Saints, being publicly celebrated, occasioned the confluence of Gentiles as well as Christians, and innumerable things were done, which seemed miracles done by God, to attest the honour done them, and the truth of Christianity which it supposed, I acknowledge those great lights did think fit to address themselves to them as petitioners; but so at the first, as those that were no ways assured by our common Christianity, that their petitions arrived at their knowledge. You have seen S. Augustine acknowledge that they must come by such means, as God is no way tied to furnish. Greg. Nazianz.

Mr. Phillips in a solitary quotation from the Fathers, alleges in justification of the shocking Psalter, called St. Bonaventure's, "the great S. Augustine;" yet the Benedictines again call the homily, (which is given to S. Augustine in the Breviary,) "the work of some unskilful patchwork-maker." (on Serm. 194. App. al. de Sanctis 18.) Again, Dr. Wiseman in his recent Letter to Mr. Palmer, quotes confidently on the same subject, as words of S. Ephraem, certain prayers found mostly in a solitary *Greek* MS. which the Benedictine editors themselves give not as S. Ephraem's, but an unknown Monk's, called Thecaras. Nor is it even said that they are *collected* from S. Ephraem's writings; they are simply appended to some prayers for the subduing of the passions, which are said to be so collected. The prayers are certainly not S. Ephraem's; the style is wholly unlike the richness of that father's language. They are of the same stamp as what Cave (Hist. Lit. s. tit.) calls, sequiorum sæculorum deliramentum. Yet on this authority, Dr. W. quotes "S. Ephraem Syrus, the friend of S. Basil, as using prayers which go far beyond what [Roman] Catholics are in the habit of using now-a-days." Again, he quotes as S. Gregory of Nazianzum's, the Christus Patiens, which both the Benedictines and the recent editor pronounce not to be his, and the Benedictines say of the words, that "they savour at least of the age of Damascene, or even one much later than the 8th or 9th." Romanist citations of the fathers always require to be sifted; their system not being really founded on Antiquity, but on the authority of the existing Church, they are careless how they quote.

speaks to Gorgonia in his oration upon her, and to Constantius, in his first oration against Julian, but under a doubtful condition, if they were sensible of what he spake. Enough to distinguish praying to God, from any address to a creature, though religion be the ground of it. And when the apparitions about their monuments were held unquestionable, yet it was questioned, whether the same soul would be present at once in places of so much distance, or Angels appear like them, as you may see in the answer aforesaid, p. 391. 394. Nay, Hugo de S. Victore in Cassander, Epist. xix. hath enabled him to hold, that the Litanies do not suppose that the Saints hear them, and therefore are expounded by some to signify conditional desires, if God grant them to come to their knowledge. But of that I speak not yet, only as it enables me to conclude, that this kind of prayer is not idolatry. This necessarily follows from the premises; because a man cannot take that Saint or Angel for God, whose prayers he desires;—but manifestly shews that his desire is grounded upon the relation which he thinks he hath to him, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by His Church. Nevertheless, though it be not idolatry, the consequence and production of it not being distinguishable from idolatry, the Church must needs stand obliged to give it those bounds that may prevent such mischief as that which shall make it no Church."—

It were well if the Romish Church, which so gladly pleads in her behalf the charitable allowances made by Thorndike, that he need not necessarily pronounce her idolatrous, although she tolerates what leads to idolatry, would also consider his warning against her sanctioning practices, which naturally lead to it, and his strong conviction that the existence of such practices, unforbidden by authority, must be "one of the most considerable titles," as for our original "reformation without consent of the whole," so also for continued

separation. It is sad to see a serious person [o] thus defend the Invocation, " deliver us, holy Virgin Mary ;"

" Why do not such persons compile a ' dictionary' or a ' speaker's assistant;' in which we may find words to express fully and adequately our thoughts, and the different tempers and motives of our minds ?"

Such language, and that cited by Archbishop Ussher, is not only liable to be taken in an unsound sense, but the unsound is its obvious meaning.

Thorndike then thus proceeds ;

" Suppose a simple soul can distinguish between Ora pro nobis, and Domine miserere ; between ' Pray for us,' and ' Lord have mercy upon us ;' how shall I be assured, that it distinguishes between the honour that Pagans gave the less gods, under Jupiter the Father of Gods, and that which himself gives the Saints, under the God of those Saints ? And is it enough, that the Church enjoins not nor teaches idolatry ? Is it not further bound to secure us against it ? I know not whether it can be said that Processions and Litanies are voluntary devotions, which the people are not answerable for, if they neglect. They were first brought in, and since frequented at the instance of Prelates, and their Clergy ; and if they be amiss, the people are snared by their means : that is, by the Church, if the Church bear them out in it. And by these three sorts of Prayers, it appears that without giving bounds to private conceits, there is [no] means to stop men's course from that extremity, which whether it be real idolatry or not, nothing can assure us. Upon these terms I stand. I have heard those relations, upon credit not to be ques-

[o] Dr. Butler, Lect. 12. p. 360.

tioned, which make their devotions to Saints hardly distinguishable from the idolatries of Pagans. That they who preferred them could not, or did not, distinguish, I say not. In fine, they demonstrate manifold more affection for the Blessed Virgin, or some particular Saints, than for our Lord. That they call not upon Saints to pray for them, but to help them; that they neither express nor can be presumed to mean by praying for, but by granting their prayers; in fine, *that they demonstrate inward subjection of the heart wherein idolatry consists;* I cannot disbelieve those who relate what they see done. What may be the reason, why to them rather than to God?"

"I grant it no Idolatry, that is, not *necessarily* any Idolatry, to pray to Saints to pray for us. The very matter implies an equivocation in the word 'praying,' which nothing hinders the heart to distinguish. But is it fit for the Church to maintain it, because it is necessarily no Idolatry? I grant, 'Ora pro nobis' in the Litanies might be taken for the ejaculation of a desire, which a man knows not whether it is heard or not; (as some instance in a letter, which a man would write, though uncertain whether it shall come to hand or not;) and I could wish that the people were taught so much by the form, as a powerful means to preserve the distance between God and His creature alive in their esteem. I count it not fit for a private person to say, what might be condescended to, for the re-union of the Church, stopping the way upon those mischiefs, which the flourishing times of the Church have not prevented. While all bounds are refused, all extremities maintained, I allege it for one of the most considerable titles for reformation without the consent of the whole."

Enough will now have been said to vindicate the distinction between the occasional addresses, which occur in the fourth century, requesting the

prayers of the Saints, and the systematic devotions prevalent in the Romish Church, requesting their aid absolutely, and preferring them, upon system, to immediate application to our Lord. Since this distinction is so broad, and appeared so to such writers as Archbishops Ussher and Bramhall[a], Bp. Andrews[b], and Thorndike, there is clearly no ground, why we should suppose that our Article, in condemning the "Romish doctrine of Invocation of Saints," had any reference to these addresses of the fourth century. At the same time, persons cannot be too strongly warned against the risk to their own souls, in resuming, even in its lightest form, a practice, which does not come recommended to us by the Primitive Church, and which Scripture, to say the least, in principle, discourages; which, as a *systematic* practice, does not seem to be countenanced even by the age in which it was introduced, the addresses in the fourth century being rather apostrophes to the blessed Saints who were at the moment before the minds of those who used them, than systematic requests for their intercession. And yet even this alone would obviously make a great difference in the religious influence of such addresses; the *systematic* application for their intercessions has

[a] Works, p. 418, quoted in Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 14.

[b] Answer to c. 20. of Card. Perron's Reply, p. 57—62, quoted Tract 90, p. 41, 2.

manifestly a tendency, which such occasional apostrophes as we find in the fourth century at all events have not, to give them a place in our thoughts which should be occupied only by the One Intercessor. Systematic addresses to them constitute them, so far, direct objects of our devotions, which having, as our friend observes, "less of awe and severity," may be gradually resorted to in preference, in order to "save men the necessity of lifting up their minds to their Sanctifier and their Judge." It is to be considered, whether *habitual* addresses to the Saints do not, in the mildest form, imply that they are *themselves*, in some degree, objects of devotion. In the case of friends on earth, with which these addresses are paralleled, we are content to ask their intercessions once for all, or as an emergency occurs; we do not habitually ask them to "pray for us;" we take it for granted that they do; the continual use then of these supplications to the Saints, (who, as being purified, must love us better, and be more ready to pray for us than our friends on earth,) seems in itself to imply that some other feeling has crept in, beyond the wish to secure their intercessions; that people apply to them, as a vent to their feelings; that they have unconsciously made them ends and objects of devotion, and are thereby associating other objects in their devotional feelings with their One lawful Object, our Maker, Redeemer, Sanctifier; are learning to

have recourse to them, together with Him and in His place. There is also in itself so much risk in addressing prayers to one unseen, who is not God; it is, on the one hand, so much an act of devotion, and on the other, our devotions to God are at best so imperfect, so little elevated, that there is on this ground alone much risk, lest the acts of devotion to the creature and to the Creator should be of the same kind, and so those to the creature idolatrous. The very fact that we find these appeals first in very holy men, may be (as our friend observes) a ground to discourage such as we are, not to encourage us; the less like them we are, the less should we imitate them in this one point. "It [c] is nothing to the purpose to urge the example of such men as S. Bernard, in defence of such invocations. The holier the man, the less likely they are to be injurious to him; but it is another matter entirely when ordinary persons do the same." There would be also an especial risk in such practices in our own Church, beyond what there is even in the Romish; they do not come recommended to *us* by our immediate Mother, any more than by the Church Catholic; one who should adopt them, would do so on doubtful precedents, and on his own "private judgment;" he would do it altogether on his own responsibility, as his own act, contrary to what his Church deems advisable for

[c] Mr. Newman's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 19. The whole page is a very valuable warning.

her children generally, and as I said, having no sanction (as in the case of prayers for the Saints at rest) from the Church Catholic; he ought also to have fears lest he be actuated herein by mixed motives, such as imagination, excitement, novelty, and so to doubt the lawfulness of the action in himself, over and above its abstract questionableness: he can, or ought, hardly to feel absolutely assured of its propriety, and ought then well to consider, why he does not come under the Apostle's rule, "He that doubteth is damned if he eat, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Lastly, if any ever so much desire to have the intercession of those, who see their Redeemer face to face, it is so safe to ask Him to put in their minds to pray Him for them, so unsafe to apply to them directly, that they must, surely, feel that they are exposing themselves very gratuitously to risk in adopting a practice to which there are so many grave objections, when the object they have at heart can be obtained more surely, because sought for more humbly, without it.

I need only, in conclusion, express the earnest hope, in which you will so strongly join, that any one, who after the example of our friend, finds himself called upon to give an opinion that "the *ora pro nobis* is not necessarily included in the Invocation of Saints, which the Article condemns," will follow him also in expressing his "great apprehension concerning the use even of such modified

invocations[d]." And altogether, the less such a subject is discussed, obviously the better; the very mention of it may prove a snare to some minds, who are not trained in those feelings of reverence, which happily prevail in this place; it is not and ought not to be a practical question to us; but the abstract discussion of questions involving great practical consequences, yet unfelt by those discussing them, is too likely to divest the mind of those feelings of solemn responsibility without which no religious question can be discussed without injury.

4, 5. *Veneration and worshipping of Images and Relics.*

The less need be said on this, the remaining subject of this Article, because, although the feeling of the Ancient Church with regard to relics was very different from that common now, there was no view in any part of it which any way approximated to the Romish doctrine or practice. On the contrary, the primitive doctrine and prac-

[d] Meanwhile, it is very comforting to see younger men also alive to this especial danger, "Through the course which Mr. N. has now been obliged to take, the 'ora pro nobis' may have been brought before persons, who would otherwise never have thought of it, and who may take it up from the mere affectation of singularity or what may be called a restless love of newly seen and dimly apprehended truth." A Few More Words in Support of No. 90, &c. by Rev. W. G. Ward.

tice, on the subject of images, was so strict, that the difficulty would rather be to reconcile the "having" images at all, with it; of worship or outward reverence there was no trace. I will not here repeat what I hope shortly to give at length; I will only then mention to you the result of a careful examination, in which I sifted every thing alleged about images in the early centuries. This I have thus summed up[e];

"1. In the three first centuries it is positively stated that the Christians had no images. 2. Private individuals had pictures, but it was discouraged. (Aug.) 3. The Cross, not the Crucifix, was used; the first mention of the Cross in a Church is in the time of Constantine. 4. The first mention of pictures in Churches (except to forbid them) is at the end of the fourth century; and these, historical pictures from the O. T. or of martyrdoms, not of individuals. 5. No account of any picture of our Lord being publicly used occurs in the six first centuries, (the first is in Leontius Neap. l. v. Apol. pro Christian. A. D. 600.) 6. Outward reverence to pictures is condemned." [And this as late as Gregory M., who speaks in his genuine works very decisively against outward reverence to images, the passage apologizing for it being spurious.]

One cannot again imagine any thing more strikingly opposed to the Romish apologies for their worship before images, or a more valuable warning against their peril, than the following passage of S. Augustine[f];

[e] Library of the Fathers; Tertullian. Note B. on Apology, p. 116.

[f] In Ps. 113. Serm. 2. §. 5.

" Who worships or prays, *looking upon an image*, and does not become so affected as to think that he is heard by it, as to hope that what he longs for will be granted him by it?—Against this feeling, whereby human and carnal infirmity may easily be ensnared, the Scripture of God utters things well known, whereby it reminds and rouses as it were the minds of men, slumbering in the accustomed things of the body ; ' The images of the heathen,' it says, ' are silver and gold.' " He then (§. 6.) meets the objection, that the Christians too had *vessels* of silver and gold, the works of men's hands, for the service of the Sacraments. " But," he asks, " have they mouths, and speak not ? have they eyes, and see not ? do we pray to them, in that, through them, we pray to God ? This is the chief cause of that frantic ungodliness, that a form, like one living, has more power over the feelings of the unhappy beings, causing itself to be worshipped, than the plain fact that it is not living, so that it ought to be despised by the living. For images are of more avail to bow down the unhappy mind (in that they have mouth, have eyes, have ears, have nostrils, have hands, have feet,) than it hath to correct it that they speak not, see not, hear not, smell not, touch not, walk not."

With regard to " relics" on the other hand, the later corruptions have given a turn to our *feelings*, at variance with those of the early Church, though their practice did not differ from our's. The Roman practice condemned, appears, from the Homilies, to have been the " offering incense[h]" to the reliques ; and of this or of any other outward veneration to them, no traces are pretended to be

[h] Homily on Good Works, P. 2. p. 54. On Peril of Idolatry, P. 3. p. 220, 249.

found in the Ancient Church. Those who love the early Church have to regret a tone of mind, which seems estranged from her's; yet was there nothing in her practice which modern notions could include under the censure of "veneration of relics." There is no question then as to the interpretation of the Article; only as to the tone of mind of those who expound them, lest they speak slightingly of sacred feelings, and, as I said, foster the principle of rejecting the evidence of miracles, like the Jews or modern Deists, on à priori grounds. The feeling about relics, too common among us, is sadly natural. Who would not of himself love, as they of old did, the ashes of the "noble army of martyrs?" or whose eyes would not gush out with tears at sight of a fragment of the true Cross? who would not (in St. Jerome's[1] words) "worship prostrate before it, as though he saw the Lord hanging thereon?" who can even realize to himself the awful reality of what he should feel? and yet, in proportion as he would love them, if he had ground to believe them real, he must grieve over the avarice of men, which so multiplied them, that our later Church knows not where she has them. Nor is it strange that the lying miracles of later days, connected with supposed relics, should create a repugnance to believe true miracles, wrought by God in connection with the true. Yet to persist, against evidence, to deny earlier miracles, were to act

[1] In vit. Paulæ Ep. 108. §. 9.

upon passion, not on the love of the truth. Rather, since God did work miracles by them in those days, one should, on that ground, adhere the more closely to that Faith, which He attested by miracles, and the more look with reverence and longing to those holy days, when God vouchsafed to form saints whom He crowned with martyrdom, and copy the practices whereby they were so formed, and seek by a holy life the indwelling of that Holy Spirit, which so hallowed even the "dry bones" of those who had been so eminently His temple, that they still "lived," and "being dead, yet spake," and became to others the source of earthly, and thereby also of spiritual, life and healing.

The several instances of the respect paid by the Ancient Church to "relics" are embodied in the following vindication by Thorndike[1]; in which no one of our Church, (whatever vague impressions he may have had,) will probably find any thing which he would wish to gainsay.

"He that could wish, that the memories of the Martyrs, and other Saints who lived so as to assure the Church they would have been Martyrs had they been called to it, had not been honoured, as it is plain they were honoured by Christians, must find in his heart by consequence to wish that Christianity had not prevailed. For, this honour, depending on nothing but assurance of their happiness, in them that remained alive, was that which moved unbelievers to bethink themselves of the

1 Epilogue iii. 30. p. 354.

reason they had to be Christians. What were then those honours? Reverence in preserving the remains of their bodies and burying them, celebrating the remembrance of their agonies every year, assembling themselves at their monuments, making the days of their death festivals, the place of burial Churches, building and consecrating Churches to the service of God in remembrance of them, I will add further, (for the custom seemeth to come from undefiled Christianity,) burying the remains of their bodies under the stones upon which the Eucharist was celebrated. What was there in all this but Christianity? That the circumstances of God's service, which no law of God had limited, the time, the place, the occasion of assembling for the service of God (always acceptable to God) should be determined by such glorious accidents for Christianity, as the departure of those, who had thus concluded their race. What can be so properly counted the reign of the Saints and Martyrs with Christ, which St. John foretelleth, Apoc. xx. as this honour, when it came to trample Paganism under feet, after the conversion of Constantine? Certainly, nothing can be named, so correspondent to that honour which is prophesied for them that suffered for God's law, under Antiochus Epiphanes. Dan. xii. Is not all this honour properly derivative from the honour of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and relative to His service? For, that is the work for which Christians assemble, and for those assemblies the Church stands, as I have often said; the honour of the Saints, but the occasion, circumstance, or furniture for it."

Art. xxxii.

"Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage."

"There is," as our friend said, "no subject for controversy in these words, since even the most determined advocates of the celibacy of the clergy admit their truth." Not only S. Jerome, whom he quotes, but even modern Romanists rest clerical celibacy on ecclesiastical rule, not on "God's law." On the other hand, it should be observed, that the tone of the Article is contrary to men's modern practice; it does not take it for granted, as a matter of course, that clergymen will marry, as soon as they can provide for a family; as if this were obviously the best both for themselves and those committed to them; but it implies, as does the Marriage Service for all, that it is a matter of Christian prudence and wisdom to decide, in which estate, married or single, they may best serve the Lord, and that they will decide, not with a view to earthly joy, but "as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."

A contemporary document implies the feeling of those times to have been in favour of the celibacy of the Clergy; our Marriage Service goes further, and, in the midst of its touching commendation of the "honourable estate" of matrimony, implies a holy celibacy to be for those to

whom it is given, a higher state. For in that it speaks of "continency" as a "gift," it must imply that it is an especial favour of God to those to whom it is given.

"Although[n] it were not only better for the estimation of Priests, and other Ministers in the Church of God, to live chaste, sole, and separate from the company of women and the bond of marriage, but also thereby they might the better attend to the administration of the Gospel, and be less intricated and troubled with the charge of household, being free and unburdened from the care and cost of finding wife and children, and that it were most to be wished, that they would willingly and of themselves endeavour themselves to a perpetual chastity and abstinence from the use of women."

In the Lord's vineyard, however, there is ample room for those of both classes; our Universities still furnish an instance before our eyes, of institutions requiring a temporary celibate, and that during the most trying period of life, and often for the greater part of its probable term: and, as this shews that it is not foreign to the genius of our Church, so the conviction is continually growing, that if the degraded masses condensed in our overgrown towns, inaccessible to any means now existing, festering within themselves, yet shunning every thing unlike themselves, may yet be reclaimed, it will be, when God raises up among us men of self-denying habits, who, under the direction of our Bishops, shall gather round them others like-minded, and form

[n] Stat. An. 2 and 3 Edw. VI. c. 21.

corresponding institutions for those who have "forsaken all" to "follow" their Lord, to seek out His scattered sheep even in these appalling wildernesses, and preach repentance from dead works, Judgment to come, and the vanity of this fleeting world, having themselves, like the self-denying Baptist, visibly no portion in it.

It is, again, felt continually more, that besides the domestic charities so lovelily set forth by the daughters of our land, there is room for institutions, in which such as have no sacred duties at home, may devote their whole lives to visit their Lord in His sick, poor, imprisoned, naked, hungry, thirsty members[n]. Such institutions do shed a lustre upon any

[n] Since the above was written, the following remarkable confirmation has occurred in a Preface written to controvert what the Author supposes to be the peculiar views of Mr. Newman and his friends. Amid grave difference of opinion, the tone of the whole Preface seems to betoken a drawing together of men's minds, even when they must still oppose each other, and deprecate any extension of that which is peculiar to the other. The whole passage is very illustrative of what Mr. Newman has said of the moving "of the religious mind of our Church to something better and truer than satisfied the last century."

"No wise man doubts that the Reformation was imperfect, or that in the Romish system there were many good institutions, and practices, and feelings, which it would be most desirable to restore amongst ourselves. Daily church services, frequent communions, memorials of our Christian calling continually presented to our notice, in crosses and way-side oratories; commemorations of holy men, of all times and countries, the doctrine of the communion of saints practically taught, religious orders, especially of women, of different kinds, and under different rules, delivered only from the snare and sin of perpetual vows; all these, most of

Church; they are evidences of self-denying holiness fostered within it; the "sœurs de la charite" not only create a rightful sympathy towards the Churches wherein they exist, but they are one of the most powerful attractions to withdraw feeling but undisciplined minds from the communion of our own; they would be a grace to us, if we had them; the lack of them exposes us to loss. On this account alone, then, people should beware how they lightly speak against the celibate as a whole. Yet probably the objection arises from confusing *compulsory* with voluntary celibacy; the high feelings of devotedness which would with joy realize such a calling do exist among us; and it need, I think, but be known that there are (as there are) means provided for exercising such a calling under protection, and we too shall have our "sisters of charity." Parents willingly part with a daughter for an earthly bridal; some will be

which are of some efficacy for good, even in a corrupt church, belong no less to the true Church, and would be purely beneficial." (Preface to Dr. Arnold's Sermons on the Christian Life, p. lvi. v.)

There is no need of "perpetual vows;" in France vows are allowed by the State to be taken only for five years; any vow should, of course, be taken with much humility and circumspection, and after trial and acquired knowledge of a person's own strength and weakness; only it does not appear why, when "perpetual vows" are permitted and encouraged in the Old Testament, and that even by parents in behalf of their children, (as in the case of Samuel, not to speak of Samson,) they should, under the New, in which greater strength is given, be accounted as necessarily "a sin."

found to spare them to be "brides of Christ," ministers to Him in His sick.

On the other hand, *our* Reformation stands clear from that sad and inexplicable act of foreign Reformers, (which Romanists so willingly impute to all[o],) when they deliberately sanctioned a Prince's polygamy[p] as a remedy against a grosser adultery: our Reformers were bound by no vows to celibacy[q], so that Cranmer who married, broke none; others voluntarily abstained from that, which they wished to be left free to each, as they should "judge the same to serve better to godliness," thereby shewing that they advocated its legality, not as a skreen for themselves, but as thinking *compulsory* celibacy inexpedient and dangerous. In our Church no nun[r] was tempted to break her vows.

On this whole subject, it were well if before people allow themselves to use or to listen to the hard speeches which have of late years been uttered against the notion of celibacy as a religious act, or the view of it in the Ancient Church, they would consider how they escape therein speaking against their Lord. Certainly, the principle of religious celi-

[o] e. g. Dr. Butler, Lect. 5. p. 250. 267.

[p] The dispensation given by Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, and four others, to the Landgrave of Hesse, to marry a second wife, in the lifetime of the first.

[q] "The vow of chastity, which existed in the Ordination-service of the foreign Churches, formed no part of that used in England." Short, Hist. of Eng. Ch. §. 311.

[r] Dr. Butler, l. c. p. 267. Exactly the same things were brought forward before him by Dr. Milner, End of Controversy.

bacy is so plainly set down by Himself, that it seems to imply a strange ignorance or sad neglect of His word, to dare to call that principle in question. And His word is not like S. Paul's limited, by "the present distress [a]," but, like Himself, eternal. Our Church, as I said, recognises that principle in her Marriage Service. I will now but set down those His words, and, with Thorndike's [b] comment on them, so leave the subject.

"Matt. xix. 11, 12. All are not capable of this word (of not marrying). 'For there are eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb; and there are eunuchs which were made eunuchs by men: and there are eunuchs that have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven. He that is capable let him hold this.' Here it is said that God hath made some men of such constitution of nature, that they are able to contain themselves from marriage, and that this is the gift of continence, which whoso hath, falls under a command of not marrying; whoso hath not, of marrying. But when our Lord exhorts those that are able to contain themselves from marriage to strive for that grace, certainly He makes not that a gift of nature, which He would have a man endeavour to attain. He that is exhorted to make himself an eunuch is not so made by God, but from God he hath the grace to prefer the kingdom of Heaven before even that content which God alloweth him here; and if he betray not that grace, by preferring that content before the clearest and securest means of attaining it, he will not fail of grace to perform that which he resolves for God's sake. And truly it were strange that the Gospel should make that grace which

[a] 1 Cor. vii.

[b] Epilogue, p. ii. c. 33. p. 296.

conducts to the height of Christianity, to consist in an endowment of nature."

Article xxxvii.

"The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England."

I only set this Article down, that I may not seem to omit any thing, yet there is no question to be raised upon it. It relates to temporals, not to spirituals. The "jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome" stands contrasted with "the chief power of the King's Majesty," and this is, in the Article itself, limited to things temporal. The Article is entitled, "Of the Civil Magistrates." It begins by claiming the "chief power or government of all estates of this realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes" to the "King's Majesty," and denies that it "ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction." It then explains the "chief Government" claimed for the King, negatively, not to be "the ministering either of God's word or of the Sacraments," and positively to be only, "that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers." Accordingly, its chief object is to deny the right of appeal to Rome in the case of ecclesiastical persons or causes. Then it subjoins the words prefixed above. Clearly, then, from the

whole tenor of the Article, the "jurisdiction" denied is a "temporal jurisdiction as to spiritual causes or persons." And this is illustrated by the oath of supremacy. "No foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, or authority within this realm." Both deny to the Bishop of Rome, what and what only they claim to the King. The oath of supremacy is a negative oath of allegiance. It rejects all allegiance which may interfere with the allegiance to the King. The very terms of the oath of supremacy, (in that it puts together "prelate, state, potentate,") imply that what it contemplates is any such "jurisdiction," as shall interfere with the authority of the sovereign. Thus Archbishop Bramhall[r];

"Whatsoever power our Laws did divest the Pope of, they invested the King with it: but they never invested the King with any Spiritual power or jurisdiction; witness the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth; witness the public Articles of the Church; witness the professions of King James; witness all our Statutes themselves, wherein all the parts of Papal power are enumerated which are taken away; his Encroachments, his Usurpations, his Oaths, his Collations, Provisions, Pensions, Tenths, First-fruits, Reservations, Palls, Unions Commendam, Exemptions, Dispensations of all kinds, Confirmations, Licenses, Faculties, Suspensions, Appeals, and God knoweth how many pecuniary artifices more: but of them all, there is not

[r] Schism guarded, sect. i. c. 9. Works, p. 340. referred to in Palmer on the Church, p. ii. c. 2.

one that concerneth Jurisdiction purely Spiritual, or which is an Essential right of the power of the Keys; they are all Branches of the External Regiment of the Church, the greater part of them usurped from the Crown, sundry of them from the Bishops, and some found out by the Popes themselves, as the payment for Palls, which was nothing in St. Gregory's time, but a free gift or liberality or bounty, free from imposition and exaction.

" Lastly, consider the grounds of all our grievances expressed frequently in our Laws, and in other writers, the disinheriting of the Prince and Peers, the destruction and annullation of the Laws and the prerogative Royal, the vexation of the King's Liege People, the impoverishing of the Subjects, the draining the Kingdom of its Treasure, the decay of Hospitality, the disservice of God, and filling the Churches of England with Foreigners, the excluding Temporal Kings and Princes out of their Dominions, the Subjecting of the Realm to spoil and ravine, gross Simoniacal Contracts, Sacrilege, grievous and intolerable oppressions and extortions. Jurisdiction purely Spiritual doth neither disinherit the Prince nor the Peers, nor destroy and annul the Laws and Prerogative Royal, nor vex the King's Liege People, nor impoverish the Subject, nor drain the Kingdom of its Treasures, nor fill the Churches with Foreigners, nor exclude Temporal Kings out of their Dominions, nor subject the Realm to spoil and ravine. Authority purely Spiritual is not guilty of the Decay of Hospitality or disservice of Almighty God, or Simony, or Sacrilege, or oppressions and extortions. No, no, it is the external Regiment of the Church, by new Roman Laws and Mandates, by new Roman Sentences and Judgments, by new Roman Pardons and Dispensations, by new Roman Synods and Oaths of Fidelity, by new Roman Bishops and Clerks. It is your new Roman Tenths and First-fruits and Provisions and Reservations and Pardons and Indulgences, and the rest of those horrible mischiefs

and damnable customs, that are apparently guilty of all these evils. These Papal Innovations we have taken away indeed, and deservedly, having shewed the express time, and place, and person, when and where, and by whom every one of them was first introduced into England.

And again[x],

"We have only cast out seven or eight branches of Papal jurisdiction in the exterior court; which Christ or His Apostles never challenged, never exercised, never meddled with; which the Church never granted, never disposed. He might still for us enjoy his Protopatriarchate, and the dignity of an Apostolical Bishop, and his primacy of order, so long as the Church thought fit to continue it to that See, if this would content him."

Or again, to take the words of a recent author, following Abp. Bramhall[y].

"The learned primate Bramhall has observed, that these acts were not intended to deprive the Roman Pontiff of any really spiritual power; they only cast out some branches of his exterior jurisdiction which were not instituted by Christ, nor by the Catholic Church. They did not deny the precedency of the Bishop of Rome in the Universal Church, nor his right (in conjunction with Christian princes) of summoning and presiding in General Councils, nor his power of defining questions of faith in conjunction with the Catholic Church, nor his right to exhort all Bishops to observe the Canons, nor his being the centre of Catholic unity, when he is in communion with all the Catholic Church. None of these things (the chief privileges of the Roman primacy according to Romanists)

[x] ib. sect. 5.

[y] Palmer, l. c.

were affected by the Acts of Parliament for abolishing the usurped jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop in England; and therefore it is vain to impute schism or heresy to the Church of England on this account, even on the supposition that the primacy of the Roman See is of divine institution."

I do not mean, of course, to imply by this, that the Bishop of Rome has any lawful claims to "spiritual supremacy" over us; our very acknowledgment of our Articles implies our sense of a right committed to us, to regulate the affairs of our Church (whenever this should be necessary) by and for ourselves. I only mean, as a matter of fact, that any discussions as to any spiritual authority of the Bishop of Rome,—supposing that he was in communion with the whole Church, or that he would acknowledge its authority to be superior to his own,—is foreign to this Article, which relates to things temporal only. Meanwhile, it may be said that a primacy of order, and the claim that no Council should be considered Œcumenical and authoritative which lacked the concurrence of so eminent a See, as they will abundantly satisfy both the concessions of any of the early fathers, and the claims of the earlier Popes, so may they be obviously conceded without any risk to the safety of our Provincial Church.

On the same ground, lest I should appear to gloss over any thing, I would just advert to three other

Articles not relating to questions in which we are at issue with the Romish system, and apparently not contemplated by those, who condemned the principles of the Tract. So much has been written on them lately, that I may be the more brief here.

Article xi.

"That we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine."

On Article xi. our friend contends, that "Justification by faith only," as the instrument through which we receive it, does not exclude "Baptism" from being the instrument through which God conveys it; and this is indeed so palpable from the Article itself, which is contrasting only "the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," received "through faith," with "our own works or deservings," that it seems strange how any should have thought that the doctrine of Baptism entered at all into the subject of this Article. The Article simply contrasts "the merits of our Lord and Saviour" and "our works," and says we are justified for the sake of the one, not of the other; it is employed in laying down one principle, not in stating the whole compass of divinity; the doctrine of the Sacraments comes in elsewhere; the Article contrasts, as the source or meritorious

causes of Justification, "the Merits of our Lord" and "our own merits;" and these would naturally exclude each other; but "our Lord's merit" as the "sole *source* of our justification" does not exclude "Baptism" as the "sole channel" through which He conveys it, any more than it does faith as the sole instrument through which we receive it. The whole is concisely worded thus[a];

"We are justified by Christ alone, in that He has purchased the gift; by Faith alone, in that Faith asks for it; by Baptism alone, for Baptism conveys it; and by newness of heart alone, for newness of heart is the life of it."

Articles xii. and xiii.

"Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit ['before justification,' title of the Article] are not pleasant to God (minimè Deo grata sunt) forasmuch as they spring not of Faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make man meet to receive grace, or (as the School authors say) deserve grace of congruity (merentur gratiam de congruo); yea, rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin. Albeit good works, which are the fruits of faith and follow after justification (justificatos sequuntur), cannot put away (expiare) our sins and endure the severity of God's judgment, yet are they pleasing and acceptable (grata et accepta) to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith."

As, in Article xi. "the merits of our Lord" are

[a] Tract 90, p. 13.

contrasted with "our own," so in Articles xii. and xiii. our own works before and after justification are broadly contrasted with each other; and one chief object of the two Articles plainly is, to carry out the contrast of Article xi., and to declare that our works are no ways the meritorious cause of our acceptableness with God;—not those before justification, because "they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done," and so "have the nature of sin;" nor those after, because 1) they "cannot put away our sins," nor 2) even in themselves "endure the severity of God's judgment;"—and therefore we must on both grounds have recourse to the merits of our Lord to efface our sins, and obtain a merciful judgment for our good works. We are, then, thus contemplated in these Articles, as in two conditions, "justified" and "unjustified," and our works are declared broadly and on the whole, in our unjustified state to have "the nature of sin;" good works, in our justified state, are said to be "pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ." But although, to use our friend's strong words in another place [b], of our state by nature,

"all that we do, whether from better principles or from worse, whether of an indifferent nature or directly moral, whether spontaneously, or habitually, or accidentally, all is pervaded with a quality of evil so odious to

[b] On Justification, p. 97.

Almighty God, as to convert even our best services into profanations; or, in the expressive words of St. Paul, 'They that are in the flesh cannot please God;'"

it does not follow, of course, that all works "before justification" have equally "the nature of sin." Each of these states,—justification, or being unjustified,—admits of infinite variations and degrees, from theirs who are all but angels to theirs who are all but devils. As being justified or no, they may be considered as two states; but the individuals included under them may be in an infinite variety of relations to Almighty God. Taken as two states, the "justified" must include all, from those who have all but attained to perfection, to those in whom "the things which remain" "are ready to die," and themselves are all but out of their justified state: on the other hand, of those not justified, some may be almost Christians, others "past feeling," or without any trace of the life of God in them or of His image. But since there can be no good thing in any one, except through the Spirit of God and the grace of Christ, they who are "almost Christians" can not have become such except through His grace and inspiration; they are being "drawn by the Father" and so are in some way acceptable to Him, although, in that they are *being* drawn, and not actually "come" to the Son, they are not yet justified: still they and their actions are in an intermediate state; they are not justified, nor their good actions like the "good works" of the jus-

tified; and yet neither are they nor their actions like those whose heart the Holy Spirit has not moved nor influenced their actions. Cornelius was in a degree "accepted with God;" his "righteousness, worked" through the Divine aid, his "prayers" and his "alms" had "gone up for a memorial before God;" still he was not yet justified; for the angel, who tells him "thy prayer is heard, and thine alms are had in remembrance in the sight of God," bade him also send for St. Peter, "who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." Again, as Bishop Bull points out, since repentance and faith are required of those who come to be baptized, and repentance is not a simple feeling, but one issuing in various actions, there must be, in all cases, before justification, actions in their degree accepted by God, yet accepted not as man's own, but His, Whose gift repentance and the works of repentance are. To hear Bishop Bull[c]:

"Proceed we to the second class of testimonies, those namely in which some special works are prescribed as altogether necessary to salvation. Hereto belong passages which require repentance, as an antecedent condition, without which no one obtains forgiveness of sins from God. Such occur every where in the New Testament; to take then one or two only; Acts ii. 38. 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;' and Acts iv. 19. 'Repent therefore,

[c] Harm. Apost. c. 2. §. 6, 7.

and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the Presence of the Lord.' In these places, any one must see that besides faith, repentance from sin also, and turning to God, are required of necessity for the remission of sins or justification."

" It is further to be observed, that repentance is not one or a single work, but the complex, as it were, of many other works. For it comprehends within its compass the following works, which are neither few nor of slight account. 1) Sorrow for sins, (2 Cor. vii. 10.) 2) Humiliation under the hand of God, whereby a person humbly acknowledges that he deserves the Divine wrath, (Jas. iv. 10.) 3) Hatred and detestation of sins, (Ezek. vi. 9. xx. 43. xxxvi. 31.) 4) Confession of sins, (1 Joh. i. 9.) 5) Earnest and lowly entreaty of the Divine mercy, (Acts viii. 2.) 6) The love of God, (Ex. xx. 6.) 7) Ceasing from sin, (Prov. xxviii. 13. Is. i. 16.) 8) A firm purpose of new obedience, (Acts xi. 23.) 9) Restitution of things ill-gotten, (Ex. xxxiii. 14, 15. Lev. vi. 1—7. Luke xix. 8, 9.)—10) Forgiveness of things which our neighbours have committed against us,—(Matt. vi. 14, 15.) 11) Works of mercy or alms. Which how much they avail to obtain remission of sins from God, is sufficiently clear from that well-known passage, Dan. iv. 27. where the holy prophet suggests this wholesome counsel to king Nebuchadnezzar, as yet sticking fast in his sins, ' Redeem thy sins by almsgiving and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor.'—Herewith agreeth in the New Testament what St. James teacheth in this same 2d chapter, v. 13. ' Judgment without mercy to him, who hath shewed no mercy.' But what ' mercy' he means, is clear from what follows, v. 15, 16. See Luke xi. 41. (and Grotius on the place, Is. i. 17. Luke xvi. 9. 1 Tim. vi. 17, &c. 1 Pet. iv. 8. Heb. xiii. 16. so that Chrysostome truly said (in the Sermon on repentance), ' Repentance without almsgiving

is dead and hath no wings.' And hence (to note this by the way) arose that practice observed in the ancient Church, whereby, of such as through very grave offences had fallen under the censure of the Church, there was required, to make them capable of absolution, not only confession of sins and amendment of their past life, but also works of mercy, by them called ἀγαθοεργίαι, good works. You see how widely works of repentance extend; you see that they are all laid down by the Holy Spirit as altogether necessary to obtain forgiveness of sins."

Since, then, repentance is a work or, as Bp. Bull says, "a complex of good works," and yet antecedent to justification, it follows that there are works, in their degree acceptable to God, by Whose aid and the inspiration of Whose good Spirit they are wrought, antecedent to a man's complete justification; whereas Bp. Bull's opponent, that he might escape admitting that works had any connection with justification, consistently maintained, that "repentance or true contrition for sin, was no ways necessary to obtain the first justification." Bp. Bull, in support of his doctrine, appeals to the Homilies, our Liturgy, and Catechism, that repentance (including the fruits of repentance), as well as faith, is requisite to justification; and Field[n], whom he quotes, declares in the name of the Protestants generally;

"They teach no such thing [as they were charged with by Stapleton, 'that they make our justification to consist in the sole remission of sins by faith, that the sacraments

confer nothing to our justification]' but that Baptism and repentance are necessarily required in them that are to be first justified."

It is clear, then, that the object of our Articles was, to secure broadly the great principles, that we are accounted righteous before God, for the merits of our Redeemer, received through faith, not for our own; that even when justified, our works, through the remains of corruption in us, cannot be the grounds of our final acceptance, as neither were those before justification, of our justification; in few words, that we were chosen beforehand, of God's free grace, not on account of any thing in us, to be made members of His Son; and when in Him, are finally accepted, for His sake, in Whom we are. The doctrine, which it would exclude by Art. xiii., is a form of Pelagianism, that the works in themselves "make men meet to receive grace," that God chooses men to the privileges of the Gospel with regard to what they, by their natural powers, became: the statement, of course, does not mean to exclude the truth, that "grace used attracts more grace;" that "to him that hath, shall be given;" that obedience to God's fainter and indistincter calls is rewarded by Him by clearer and distincter, until "whom He hath called, them He also justifieth."

[m] Dr. Th. Tull quoted in the Apol. pro Harm. sect. 7. §. 2.

[n] App. to B. 3. on the Church, p. 298.

Our friend's words then seem to me fully borne out;

"They[o] [the Articles] say that works before grace and justification are worthless and worse, and that works after grace and justification are acceptable, but they do not speak at all of works with God's aid before justification."

I have now gone through the several Articles, of which explanations were given in our friend's Tract; I examined these explanations carefully, with a view to ascertain whether they did contain any relaxation of the Articles (as I myself understood them) or no; had it appeared to me so, there was yet the further question, to what extent the Articles were meant to include persons, who did not go so far from doctrine existing in the Church of Rome as their Authors; it is certain from Bp. Burnet's statement, quoted by our friend[p], that this was the object of a change in the 28th Article, when the 39 Articles were, in Q. Elizabeth's reign, formed out of the 42; to me, however, there seemed no occasion to go to this point; I have felt no doubt, carefully and conscientiously examining both editions of the Tract, that the meaning in which our friend would have them construed, in conformity and subordination to the teaching of the Church Catholic, is not only *an* admissible, but *the* most legitimate, inter-

[o] Tract 90, p. 81.

[p] Tract 90, p. 82.

pretation of them; it appears to me as clear, that they are not directed against any thing occurring, here and there, in the early Church, even though not Catholic, but against the existing system in the Church of Rome. This appears to me so plain, that I cannot but think that any who persist in those imputations of "jesuitism, dishonesty, &c." must be actuated by some "spirit, they know not of." Nor need I conceal my deep regret, that a body, for whom we both feel much respect and regard, should, in this instance, have departed from its wonted caution and tenderness of proceeding, and condemned precipitately, unexplained and unheard, the principles of the Tract, which, so suddenly brought before them, they but imperfectly understood. On a former occasion when you were away from us, they suspended, for a whole Term, the proposed condemnation of a publication, in order to give time for the Author to explain his views, and for that explanation to be weighed; on the present, they thought it better not to wait even two days. They admitted that they had no precedent upon which to proceed; but they preferred, in all this haste, to establish a new one. I do not mean to impute any personal unkindness to them; quite the contrary; some of them (deceiving themselves, I must think) thought that they were doing what was kindest towards our friend, by precipitating the condemnation of the Tract, while he was yet induced by the wishes

of friends to withhold his name; I only mean to express what is generally felt, that they acted under panic and excitement, produced by misconception and misrepresentation. They could not, I think, have judged as they did, had they allowed the first alarm and excitement to pass by, had they heard (as they were requested from more than one quarter, and from one which they ought most to have regarded) the explanation which was all but on the point of being laid before them, and "given the accused license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him." It is grievous certainly that the Heads of Houses should, on so imperfect a view of the case, have encouraged by their authority, all the imputations of dishonesty so freely cast upon us, because we understand our Church and her system in a way different from one, of late popular among persons, who, we must think, have very little studied either her, her character, or her formularies. Not less embarrassing is the very vagueness and comprehensiveness of their condemnation; "interpretations, such as are suggested in the Tract;"—*all* such are condemned; yet what they are, is left for each to gather for himself as best he may; one will claim the authority of the Board[b] for one thing, one for another,

[b] Even such a writer as Dr. Miller, gives circulation to the report, that the "Board of the University" had "actually instituted the appeal [to the Church] which he [Dr. M.] had resolved to prefer, in the transmission of a most obnoxious Tract

as each may be disposed; while I myself, and those who look on the Tract as I do, can only think that they condemned "modes of interpretation," which they inferred to be contained in it, but which never had any real existence. I should be sorry needlessly to say any thing which might pain a body, whom I much value, and from whom I hope much; yet I cannot but think that they have put themselves in a false position, condemning unheard the Tract of one, over whom they had no authority, and that in terms so vague as readily to admit of being stretched to what I am convinced they did not intend, the "mode of interpretation" really contemplated in the Tract, the Catholic interpretation of the Articles and the Catholic scheme of doctrine. I may as well speak out what is commonly felt; I cannot but think that, along with any anxiety about the danger of "modes of interpretation" of the Tract, which I have ground to think had been inculcated very earnestly upon them, they were under an unconscious bias, that they wished to relieve the University of the onus of the Tracts, as much as to condemn any "modes of interpretation;" and that the preamble "the

of which Mr. N. had acknowledged himself the writer, to the several Bishops of the English Church." (Letter to Prof. Sewell, Irish Eccl. Journ. No. 10.) A private individual did send the Tract, on his own responsibility, to the Bishops of England and Ireland, and this is made the act of the Board of Heads of Houses, and that Board the "Board of the University."

Tracts for the Times, a series of anonymous publications purporting to be written by Members of the University, *but which are in no way sanctioned by the University itself*," was as important in their eyes, as the resolution which it ushered in. Certainly, unless this had been a prominent object with them, there was no occasion for so designating the Tracts at all, and it is difficult to imagine in what way the University could have been supposed to have " sanctioned" Tracts, over which it had no control, which were not even printed within it, did not bear its " Imprimatur," did not any way fall under its statutes or its cognizance. On the other hand, while they condemned this Tract on the ground of a statute, enjoining " that every student shall be instructed and examined in the 39 Articles and shall subscribe to them ;" they left uncondemned a " History of Christianity" by one also a member and once a Professor in the University, which in a very distressing way explains away miracles of our Blessed Lord ; and yet, that same statute enjoins, that every student be instructed and examined in the " *Evidences of religion :*" they had recently listened very patiently to a sermon denying Baptismal regeneration. I do not question their right to disconnect the University from the Tracts in question, although it was done rather by a side-wind ; we never sought to compromise the University, nor to gain its sanction ; we are but what we are, private individuals in it, formed by her teach-

ing, by the spirit which she breathes, by the moral tone which her discipline imparts; her sons, and the sons of those who transmitted these doctrines to us. But now that they have formally disclaimed "any way sanctioning the Tracts" and have relieved the University of this odium, and disembarrassed her defence by her "friends without," I own I think it would be but befitting their candour, to reconsider the whole subject, qualify (if on mature thought they see occasion) the sentence which they lately passed, and state more definitely what they object to, what they do not. This they are called upon to do by others[c], in an opposite direction, and to make their condemnation more stringent. I fear nothing from the real expression of their opinion, such as it would now be formed, after the interval of peace and calm which the Holy Season, lately past, brought with it.

I would now, only, in conclusion, say a few words on two subjects incidentally connected with the Tract;—the acknowledged tendency of certain individuals in our Church to Romanism, and the position of our own Church.

[c] The Edinburgh Review, No. 147, p. 293. which very consistently urges as a ground, that on the supposed principles of Tract 90, Dissenters would be admissible to the University; which, of course, it must much deprecate!

Of the extent of the tendency to Romanism, which our friend acknowledges to exist in detached cases, I have no means of forming any estimate; but, whatever it be, it is surely a very short-sighted view to make the Tracts or their authors responsible for it. Was not the Church warned sixteen years ago, (when we were being taught, not teaching,) by that teacher whose memory we together cherish and revere, "with very solemn seriousness," to "buckle on her armour and prepare herself to defend her very citadel and the palladium of her faith?" Were there no secessions to Romanism before the Tracts began? none, and not rather in large numbers, and those wholly persons whose Church-views were most opposed to our's? In Edinburgh alone, the annual converts to Romanism were calculated at 100; but from the Kirk, not from our Church. No! Rome has many sympathies whereby to draw persons to herself. To those who would lean, she offers undoubting guidance; for those who would have certainty, she offers infallibility; for the devout, she has her Churches ever open and her frequent public services, her retreats for devotion and contemplation; for the affectionate, she has the memory of the saints of old; for the imaginative, she has a nominal reverence for Antiquity and a visible Unity of Communion, spread over the whole

[a] British Critic, No. I. 1825.

world, and every where professing to teach the same truth. Her theory of Unity (to speak of this first) at once fills the imagination and contents the intellect. It is indeed a saltus mortalis; but those who can shut their eyes and take it, it places beyond further difficulty. The visible unity of the Church falls short of what it should be and what we should have hoped; Rome cuts the knot by maintaining that her one Communion is the one Church. Her's is indeed a fearful theory, cutting off at one stroke 90 millions of the Greek Orthodox Church, as well as our own Communion. Yet, if any shrink not from this, or know not that there is a Church as large almost as that of Rome, which she cuts off from the Church "out of which there is no salvation," in order to make way for her scheme, it is a simple theory: it removes all the difficulties which these sad and long rents of the Church present to other theories of her Unity, to say boldly with Rome, that the Church is visibly one still; that intercommunion is essential to the one visible Church; that Rome and Churches not in communion with her cannot form one Church; that the Churches in communion with Rome, as being the majority of Christendom, are the Church; and that therefore Churches, not in communion with her, are no Churches. In this way, any strong statement of the claims and the unity of the Church may be made a ground for joining the Romish communion, and I myself know a

case, in which this effect was produced by some tracts of the Christian Knowledge Society.

Again, to take another class of minds, long residence at Rome, now so common with our countrymen, cannot be a thing indifferent; what is Catholic and un-Catholic is so strangely blended together in the Roman system, that if what is un-Catholic repels not, what is Catholic must win; the German artists have continually been drawn to her through their studies; among our own people, it is well known that the associations with the bright early days of the Faith, with Apostles and Martyrs, the richness of her worship, her solemn and primitive music, her paintings, her ceremonies, have again and again created a sympathy with her whole system, evil as well as good; it is idle then for persons to bring their families within the sphere of all which is fascinating to the senses in the Romish system, to take them to the ceremonies, with which, unless very well regulated or else profane, they will unduly sympathize, and then attribute to any publications in England the tendency to Romanism. Persons who had returned to this country, with a strong bias towards Rome, have been recovered by our teaching; their bias came not from us, but from the thoughtlessness which familiarized them with its mingled beauties and corruptions.

Again, another class is predisposed to Rome by the harsh language used towards her, and by

careless imputations, which they discover to be unfounded[w]: another by the conflicting opinions among ourselves, which it sees to be unnatural and a defect in the state of a Church, and which it hopes to escape by giving itself up implicitly to one, who undertakes to guide it[x]. Another is attracted by her order and discipline; another by the self-devotion of some of her members[y]; another by finding in her, amid her corruptions, (which in this country are removed from sight,) Catholic truths and practices which they have never been taught to see, where they are, in their own Church. These hear, for the first time, in her, of the high doctrine of the

[w] "I can say for myself, and I think every one who advances from Protestantism towards Catholicity can say with me, that as light breaks upon our minds we do not doubt of Rome, our doubts lie the other way; for we say Rome is right so far; we have been deceived; and being wrong in these points, there is reason to fear that we are wrong in others We doubt Protestantism as a whole, and suspect that Rome is right." "Rev. Mr. Mason, a distinguished convert," quoted in Rev. J. Rathborne's [a Romanist] Letter on the Oxford Movement, p. 18. A person's bias ought to be to trust the Communion in which he was made a member of Christ; but this writer, discovering himself to have been in error in some points as to another Communion, mistrusted his Church, and trusted Rome. In like way, the only person who went over to Rome, professing previously to have valued some of our writings, went over in about three weeks; setting aside all other circumstances, what must be thought of that person's sense of responsibility, who, in three weeks after his first impression in favour of a foreign Communion, could decide on forsaking that in which God had placed him?

[x] e. g. the authoress of the two first vols. of Geraldine.

[y] The sight of the sœurs de la charité has had this effect.

Holy Eucharist, while that of Transubstantiation is glossed over; and they think that in her alone, is the Holy Eucharist more than a sign or commemoration. They witness, in her, weekly fastings or daily prayers, and know not that their own Church enjoins the one, and provides the other; that the negligence of the laity in coming, alone hinders the daily service being realized as our Church desires. They hear, in her, that almsdeeds are good for the soul, and have not been taught the comforts of almsgiving, which our Communion Service sets forth in the words of Holy Scripture, and our Homilies from its teaching, in connection with the fathers. They hear of the value of habitual confession of sins before God's ministers, as a means of self-discipline, and of the benefits of Absolution, and know not that our Church suggests it for such as need it, and leaves them at liberty to choose for their Confessor whom they will[z]. In these and in other ways, it has continually happened that persons have sought in the Communion of Rome, what was laid up for them in their own, more fully and without corruption, had they but known it; and this valuable class will, of course, be the more secured from wandering, the more the high Catholic

[z] "Let him come unto me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word, he may receive the benefit of absolution," &c. First Exhort. in Communion Service.

doctrines of our Church are developed, and her principles acted on. Instances have recently occurred, in which by these means persons, for many years estranged from her communion, have been restored to it from that of Rome which they had joined. Again, the more people cast themselves back into Antiquity, and sympathize with the Fathers and the Saints of old, and feel themselves one Church with the Church of primitive times, the more will that painful void be filled up, which is caused by her present state of isolation. We have a communion of Saints, a fellowship of doctrine, a oneness by descent, with the Church in Apostolic days, even if those who are now in the flesh acknowledge us not.

The character also in which Rome exhibits herself in England, much aggravates our present difficulties; her policy is a corruption of the Apostolic wisdom, to "become all things to all, that by all means, it may" gain some; "it falleth down and humbleth itself, that the congregations of the poor may fall into the hands of its strong ones." Her principle, that there is no salvation out of Communion with herself, makes it her first object to draw people any how into her Communion. The extent too of her Communion is the tangible proof she puts forward of her being *the* Catholic Church. This is a sore temptation to her to bend, relax, fall in with unholy ways and usages, which promote this her first end. She would

further holiness as much as she can; but she cannot afford to do what is right, if it would cause the unholy to part from her. She is obliged to temporize, to lure, to condescend, when she cannot control. In some countries, she is suffering the penalty of former sins, having to support the credit of false miracles, which she cannot disavow, without owning the past to have been a fraud; while in all, over which she has dominion, she will tolerate and profit by what she dares not approve; will sit by in silence while men tell falsehood or use violence in her behalf; will suffer visions and miracles which she does not believe, to be believed by her people and to bring gain to her clergy; and even in her own guarded province of the faith will permit unauthorized doctrines (such as that of the immaculate Conception) to creep in and take the public honours of truth [h], wherever men are disposed to receive them. It is painful to think and speak of these things in another member of the mystical Body of Christ, who once was the bulwark of the Faith and a pattern of zeal, and who still has holy practices and institutions, which we might gladly imitate; but Rome forces it upon us by sending amongst us to steal away the hearts of the children of our Church, boldly denying whatever corruptions our people have not before their eyes; since these things were swept away by the Reformation, and she has been able to begin anew

[h] Festivals and Churches in honour of it.

in a spirit more congenial to that of religious minds here, and more approximating to early Christianity. Thus for the more "enthusiastic feelings of foreign hearts[i]," where the presence of a Reformed Church furnishes no check, she has wonder-working images of the Blessed Virgin curiously decked out, through the offerings of those taught to seek relief from them[k]; rival images, which for some time contended for superiority through the cures which they were alleged to perform, until at last popular favour having turned towards the one[l], it receives all the offerings, the other remains neglected and in disgrace; pictures of saints which are said, by being carried

[i] Dr. Wiseman, Letter to Mr. Newman, p. 25. These feelings, I am assured, meet with but partial sympathy, and sometimes with wonder and doubt, amongst Romanists of our own country who are sojourners abroad.

[k] It is but following the example of Dr. Wiseman (p. 26.) to give the following recent dialogue between an earnest-minded English Catholic traveller and the person who shewed the Church; "In a Church at Venice (I am as sure as I can be it was the del Camine) I saw a Madonna gorgeously dressed, and asked why it was so unusually decorated. The Sagrestano said, It was 'a very rich Madonna,' and that the people brought every year great offerings of oil, wax, and money. I asked why? He said, 'it had done many miracles.' I said, 'I know God could do miracles, but did not understand how an image should do miracles.' He said, 'The Madonna prays for us in Heaven.' I said, 'Supposing that to be so, I see no connection between her intercession, and this image of wood and silk.' He said, 'The faith teaches us so.'"

[l] That in the Augustinian Church, in Rome; the other is in the Pantheon.

in procession, to have stopped the plague and to have averted the Cholera; at Rome, the image of a "Holy Child" is brought forth to bless the people, and much benefit looked for by the populace from its blessing and the honour paid to it[m]; at Naples the blood of S. Januarius is still yearly liquefied[n], and the people are encouraged to look upon the imposture as the sign of the favour of the Almighty[o]; in another Church is a waxen figure of our Lord as an infant, to which the king and the Court make an annual procession at Christmas, the king carrying scissors to cut the hair of the image, which, it is asserted, grows miraculously every year[p]; at Rome is an image of the Virgin which on one day in the year nods her head

[m] It is kept in the Church of the Ara Cœli in the Capitol. Popular stories are told of its return to the Church, after it had been sent for to work a cure, and another been exchanged for it, too painfully ludicrous to set down, considering Whom the image represents.

[n] A corresponding imposture and the mode of its being wrought at Hales in Gloucestershire, is related by Bp. Burnet, Hist. Ref. b. iii. t. i. p. 441.

[o] "The scenes said often to take place on the Festival of S. Januarius almost exceed belief; if the blood liquefies quickly, all the people praise the Saint and promise him offerings; if not, they abuse him in most unmeasured terms, (some of which were repeated to me,) and threaten not to send him any more gifts, or to take any more notice of him." Statement of a traveller. It has been an habitual practice to delay the apparent liquefying of the blood and ascribe it to the presence of "heretics" (English persons).

[p] Statement of a traveller.

when she grants prayers[q]; the Church is thronged to see it; indulgences are still granted for visiting favourite shrines[r]; in Italy, the prayers which

[q] Burnet has a similar account, Hist. Ref. b. iii. t. i. p. 440, l. "For their images, some of them were brought to London, and were there, at St. Paul's Cross, in the sight of all the people, broken; that they might be fully convinced of the juggling impostures of the monks. And in particular, the crucifix of Boxley in Kent, commonly called *the rood of grace;* to which many pilgrimages had been made, because it was observed sometimes to bow, and to lift itself up; to shake, and to stir head, hands, and feet; to roll the eyes, move the lips, and bend the brows: all which were looked on by the abused multitude as the effects of a divine power. These were now publicly discovered to have been cheats: for the springs were showed, by which all these motions were made. Upon which John Hilsey, then Bishop of Rochester, made a sermon, and broke the rood in pieces." A similar story of "a wooden image of the Virgin, held in very great veneration, bowing its head in acknowledgment of salutations, and stretching forth a finger, which before was doubled," together with a miraculous voice, is gravely told in a short "treatise on the most famous confraternity of the Scapular." Dublin.

[r] The following copies of Indulgences are furnished by the traveller alluded to, note k.

1. In the Church of S. Cosmo e Damiano in the Forum at Rome.

Indulgence.

"The image (picture) of the most holy Mary which is at the great altar spoke to the Pope St. Gregory, and said to him, 'Why dost thou not salute me in passing as thou wert wont?' The Saint asked pardon, and granted to those that should celebrate mass at that altar, the liberation of a soul from Purgatory, that is, of that soul for which the mass is celebrated."

2. In the Church of S. Maria Sopra Minerva, Rome, under

occur in the middle of the sermon, seem often studiously directed to the Blessed Virgin; in the South of France, the Jesuits are now anew directing the devotions of the poorer people to the Blessed Virgin; in Ireland, it is taught that the wearing of the Scapular of the Virgin, which may be lined with silk, saves from Hell[q], and that on performance

the short exercise in honour of the afflicted heart of the most holy Mary.

Sacra Indulgenza.

"His Holiness our Lord Pope Pius VII. fel. req. vouchsafed to grant for ever the indulgence of 300 days, applicable to the holy souls in Purgatory, to all the faithful every time they shall recite the above prayers, according to the Rescript dated January 3, 1825."

3. Also over the entrance to the Chapel of Santa Maria della Salute.

"His Holiness our Lord Pope Gregory XVI. by a brief dated September 17, 1836, accorded a plenary indulgence to whomsoever, after confessing and communicating, shall devoutly visit this holy image of the blessed Virgin under the title of Consolatrice degli afflitti, on the second Sunday in July and its octave in every year. He conceded also the partial indulgence of 200 days to whomsoever, at least contrite, shall visit the same holy image on any day of the year. The above indulgences are moreover applicable to the good of the souls in Purgatory.

February 11, 1839.

4. In the Medici Chapel at San Lorenzo, Florence.

Paulus V. Pont. Max. cuique Sacerdoti qui ad hoc altare pro defunctis litaverit, animam *supremis pœnis* liberare perpetuo, AN. MDCX. concessit."

See further on Indulgences Mr. Palmer's First Letter to Dr. Wiseman, p. 16—19, 31, 2. 43. and above, p. 91. note k.

[q] "If our blessed Lady had bid us do some great thing, we ought to do it; how much rather then when she saith, Wear

of some easy conditions, she delivers those of the Confraternity from Purgatory on the first Saturday after their decease[r]; at Rome the month of May is annually devoted to her service and called by her name; her medal or picture is solemnly placed on the breasts of children; the declaration of her power and compassion is held, in spiritual exercises, to be efficacious, even with sinners who have listened unmoved to arguments from the justice and mercy of God; her name seems often to displace that of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity; she is still held

my livery and you shall not suffer eternal fire! If she had enjoined us to make a great abstinence; to undergo some rigorous mortification; or to undertake a long and tedious pilgrimage, with this condition, that we should be freed from eternal damnation; from the torments of purgatory, and from the many dangerous events which easily do befal us in this life; right reason would dictate to us, that we ought to attempt any thing for the obtaining of so great good: how much more then, when she had annexed these and many more extraordinary graces to the reception only, and devout wearing the holy habit of the Scapular, with a final confidence in her powerful protection; but you will, perhaps, with Naaman, object, what can such a weak thing avail us, as the Scapular is? To this I answer with the apostle, (1 Corinth. i. 27.) The weak things of the world hath God chosen, that he might confound the strong. He that made choice of the weak element of water to wash us from the original sin, which is deeply indicated in us by the prevarication of our first father Adam, hath made use of the weak habit of the Scapular to produce those excellent effects which are mentioned in the chapter following.

[r] Treatise on the Scapular, c. 9. (Dublin.)

out virtually as a preferable mediatrix to our Lord Himself[s], and popular feeling flows so directly towards adoration of her, that even Rome herself has at least on one occasion been forced to pause and has denied to her image, what it is shocking should ever have been asked for it[t],—honours hitherto reserved for those mysteries in which Rome acknowledges the presence of God incarnate. In the new school of art[r] in Munich, on the contrary, where religion is in a purer form, the Mother, as in the oldest school[u], has again become a subordinate object, and although enthroned, is worshipping her Son. In Ireland, Romanism becomes political and is subservient to demagogues; in the United States, she boasts that she is Republican; on the continent of Europe she courts absolute sovereigns; among ourselves, she drops, as far as possible, every thing distinctive, and assimilates herself, as much as may be, to the Anglican Church; "Transubstantiation" is represented as the doctrine of the "Real Presence;" pictures of Purgatory, and Purgatorial societies have no place, and persons are allowed to believe Purgatory itself to be only the loss of the Divine

[s] See Postscript.

[t] viz. the use of the canopy in processions.

[u] In the oldest paintings, the Madonna is introduced, meditating on or praying to, or proposing for contemplation her Infant Son; in the school of Raphael, &c. she is only shewing a mother's care, and, as the mother, is the chief object.

Presence (pœna damni), not any sensible suffering (pœna sensus), and so to differ little from the doctrine of the intermediate state[x]; (while in Ireland persons are incited to religious acts in memory of The Passion of our Lord by the grant of indulgences, many plenary, others for many hundred years[y], "applicable to *suffering* souls in Purgatory.") Invocations of Saints, in which they are called upon themselves to aid us, are withdrawn, and the practice is represented as identical with requests to friends on earth[z]; Indulgences are limited

[x] One, who had gone over to Romanism, stated to the Author that he had never met with any other doctrine as to Purgatory, among Romanists, though he had spoken with very many. The pain, according to him, consisted in an intense longing for the Divine Presence; so that, instead of being a state of "greater suffering than any thing in this life," (see above, p. 84—87,) it would be a state of higher joy than is vouchsafed to most Christians, corresponding to that spoken of in the Canticles.

[y] "The pious sodality," &c. p. 30. see above, p. 92. note k. In Bouvier, the word "suffering" does not occur. Again in the treatise on the Scapular, c. 7. "The excellency and greatness of this privilege [the speedy release of the souls of the confraternity through S. Mary] will easily appear, if we consider how horrible the *broiling* torments of purgatory are; (the angelical doctor S. Thomas saith) that they do exceed the pains, which Jesus Christ suffered in His holy Passion.—From these fearful torments the devouts of the holy Scapular are exempted, &c."

[z] Dr. Wiseman admits, "Without wishing to cast censure upon any one, I have observed with pain, that occasionally in controversy regarding the Saints and their Queen, there is a temptation to lower the consideration in which we hold them,

to the remission of punishment on this earth; "images and pictures" are become again only "instruments of teaching," or reminiscences of absent friends. "These things," said Romanist ecclesiastics from our country in the presence of one of the favourite images at Rome, "seem strange to us." "They carry the worship of the Blessed Virgin and of the Saints too far here; it interferes with the worship of God." In Italy, miracles are alleged on authority, in support of doctrine, which, in this country are withdrawn[a] from the narrative, as suspicious or unbefitting. Among us, as (in the main) a

to dim their glory, and perhaps to save ourselves some reproaches, at the expense of our Catholic brethren abroad." Remarks on Mr. Palmer's Letter, end. Dr. W. perhaps does not know, as we do, that in our countrymen of his Communion, these feelings of disparagement of their brethren abroad are not assumed only in controversy, but are often seriously entertained.

[a] "I read it [the original of Liguori's "Glories of Mary," approved of by the Convocation of Rites, with the sanction of Pius VII. 1803.] most carefully, and was surprised to find that the main proofs for this unscriptural worship was a series of visions and supposed miracles said to be wrought by images, &c. almost all of them childish beyond conception, and some of them ludicrous in the extreme. On comparing the translation with the original, I found that the translator had prudently suppressed the most silly." Rev. E. Nixon, Address to the Roman Catholic Inhabitants of Castletown, 1840. The author, who writes only in self-vindication, abstains from translating these stories, because "I do not like trifling upon any religious subject, and it would be impossible to read those fables with a grave countenance."

moral earnest people, Confession is used as a check to sin; in Italy the obligation to it is made consistent with a state of society generally and openly charged with the grossest profligacy, tempting to it, and in itself almost implying the commission of "adultery in the heart;" if common opinion be but partially grounded in truth, we must believe that adulterers and adulteresses receive absolution from the Priest, and "return to their vomit" which they never purposed to quit: while in Rome which calls itself "Mater Orbis" the first Bishop of the West presides over a government chiefly composed of Ecclesiastics, and yet so corrupt that it has passed into a proverb that the sight of Rome is incompatible with faith, "Roma veduta, fede perduta." In this country, fasting is dispensed with on account of sickness only; in Spain dispensations from fasting, except on Friday, are sold, as a matter of course, to any one, or to whole families habitually, who prefer not to fast; in Rome, the very Day of our Lord's Passion (and that, during the very hours when He was nailed to the Cross for us) is uniformly, amid some outward distinctions of meats, made by Cardinals a day of official entertainment and a feast[b]. "When I go to

[b] "On Good Friday Cardinal ——— received all the Cardinals at dinner at two in the afternoon with many Englishmen in uniform. The dinner consisted of soup, fish, cutlets, and every variety of dish all made of fish, but indistinguishable

mass in my own country," said a pious German nobleman lately, "it is to pray; but here [at Rome] prayer seems the last object for which people assemble; the fashionable Churches are mere conversaziones." And while among us corruptions are withdrawn, Rome adopts studiously "evangelical" language[c]; exhibits beautiful pictures of monastic life to attract the enthusiastic among us; introduces "orders of mercy" such as we might have ourselves, which we too need, and which are most calculated to win a kind-hearted nation. In this way, she has gained some, and is too likely to gain more; whether in the end she will not have to repay with usury those whom by such means she has gained, we cannot yet see; such converts are Anglicans at heart; at least are far nearer to our Communion, than (in its present state) to that to which they have joined themselves; this, as our Church realizes her position, they may, we trust, more and more see; their sympathies are with us, not with the corruptions in the Roman Church; we have resigned them, we trust, in chastisement only, to receive them again after a while, bringing back with them, (if it may be,)

from the richness of the sauces from any other dinner. This was annual." MS. Journal.

[c] Such was the impression upon the author, on reading the 3d vol. of Geraldine; attributed to an able controversialist. The very vehicle, being unreal, (a story,) perhaps gave the more temptation to use unreal language; yet the same has been observed by another, who would "think no evil."

the rest of that estranged Communion to our ancient British Church; we may hope that it is but like the Eastern fable, that the darkness greedily swallowed the light, but was itself overcome by that which it absorbed into itself. But though we may hope this in the end, they who join the Romish Communion in this country on the ground of its purity from what is peculiarly Romish, have no security that they may not at any time be entangled in the whole system; what has been, may again be; and one may unhesitatingly say, that it is the presence of our Church alone, which makes Romanism in this country so different from what it was, and, in Italy especially, now is. Whoever joins it from our Communion does what in him lies to bring back that darkness, by weakening the Church which mainly keeps it in check; and, since their Communion is one, he makes himself responsible for the corruption elsewhere prevailing; he countenances in others, what in his own person he avoids.

But, besides these difficulties from without, there will be, it must be added, others from within; a system, practical and reverent, as is the true Catholic system in our Church, tends more than any other, by God's grace, to produce a sense of responsibility in those who embrace it; still no scheme of doctrine will in itself protect those who hold it: in any extensive revival of doctrine, truths will be very unequally received, and will

be perverted by those who do not receive them in "an honest and true heart;" some will take them up as a beautiful theory, as matter of imagination, and these "having no root in themselves," will "in time of temptation fall away;" others will embrace them with ardour and affection, but without self-discipline and humility, and these too, it is to be feared, secure that they are standing, and not "taking heed," will fall. There are many forms of unreality; many ways in which those who are unreal, may deceive themselves, and seem to themselves wheat when they are but chaff; and, as being such, will be carried away out of the barn-floor by the sifting wind of temptation, whenever it is permitted to blow upon them. This the writers of the Tracts cannot help; they may lament to hear of persons allowing themselves in the habit of speaking indignantly of sins committed at the time of or in the English Reformation, instead of humbling themselves for "their own sins and the sins of their forefathers," and acknowledging that what we have is more than we deserve, more than we realize, is what is best fitted for us[l]; it is sad to see or hear of persons, talking and not acting; fasting, as has been said, in theory and in their studies[m]: it is sad to see people apparently prizing

[l] Tract 86. "Indications of a superintending Providence in the preservation of the Prayer book, and in the changes which it has undergone."

[m] Geraldine.

what is Catholic for its novelty not for its holiness; or tempting God, by approximating as near as they may to Romanism, and thinking that they shall not fall into it; but surely it is responsibility enough, not directly to encourage any evil tendencies. Since men "wrest Scripture to their own damnation," how much more must the words of frail man be liable to abuse.

Those, also, who have been God's chief instruments in the great work of restoring half-forgotten doctrine,—I mean our friend himself, and the Author of the Christian Year,—have again and again repeated, that the change which is going on around us is "not[n] satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movement of individuals on a particular spot." They have declined the praise; let them not unduly bear the blame. In part, we must all bear it; no one can doubt that if the system of our Church were fully carried out, her doctrine fully taught, her holy precepts acted up to, her devotions offered "in spirit and in truth," her Communions frequent and frequented as she desires, her self-denying training followed,—in a word, if all the means of grace, of which she is made the channel, were realized as they ought, God's blessing would so rest upon us, that we should have nothing to fear for our Vine; "they who pass by," would not then "pluck off her

[n] Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 27. British Critic, No. 50. "State of religious Parties."

grapes;" she would then have such marks of holiness, that they who now "gather themselves together against her would fall unto her;" her children, of whom she has been bereaved, would be restored unto her; nay, she herself might be carried to a yet higher condition; the discipline, whose loss she laments, be restored; she might, besides the hidden saints formed by her holy training, have those also who should visibly be saints, tokens, even to the world, of God's sanctifying Presence in her, like those of old, who were termed "Apostles of the nations." In whatever degree she is not such, we have all, more or less, our share of guilt; our sins, our negligences, the coldness of our intercessions, our listlessness or untamed energy, our want of holiness—each of us may know the plague of his own heart—have all contributed to deprive her of God's intended blessing, and to keep her where she is. Let us not then seek to excuse ourselves or cast the blame upon others; it is not to excuse my friends—much less myself who am least and last—that I have said even thus much, but lest "the truth" should be "evil spoken of;" let us not care where the blame lies in man's sight, but rather let us all seek, more and more, to "humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt us in due time."

Such seems to me the position which one should wish for our whole Church; this does not seem to me to have been enough realized; the sensitiveness

at some of our friend's strong language[n] on the actual condition of the Church implies this; we have been for some time on the defensive; we have been maintaining her character, as a pure and Apostolic Church, against the calumnies of men, rather than confessing before God, "for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and Thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us," and praying Him, "cause Thy Face to shine upon the sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake." To joy is more congenial than to weep; our natural love and piety towards her, as it makes us hope all good for her, and think all good of her, indisposes us to admit that there is any thing lacking to her; we think of her more, as God's Providence has formed her, than as by the remissness of our forefathers and our own, she has become; more of what she is in the abstract and in theory, than what she is, as a living, moving, acting, holy, Power, the depository of Divine graces and powers, destined not to struggle only with the world (as she is more and more) but to overcome it; not to have store of food only for such of her children as will receive it, but to bring them up, guide, restrain them; we think of the beautiful organization which her Lord has given her, that He has provided her with every thing needful for

[n] "Till her members are stirred up to this religious course, let the Church sit still; let her be content to be in bondage; let her work in chains;" &c. Tract, 90. p. 4.

all the functions of His body, and forget that through our sins she is in a state of powerlessness, His instrument still, yet not adequately performing the high destinies for which He formed, has again and again delivered, and yet preserves her.

Our true position seems to be, to acknowledge that we have fallen and that God is raising us up; amid much which is humbling, there are many cheering signs that the hand of God is with our Church; by looking exclusively on either side of the picture, we should risk forming a tone of mind, other than what is intended for us; we might be unduly elated, and forget our humility, or unduly depressed, and forget God's mercy. Our vine has been "burnt with fire and cut down," but "its branch is" again "tender and putting forth leaves," and giving signs of an approaching summer. Our Heathen populations; the extent of schism among us; fresh and fresh divisions, drawing away some of our more earnest members; our internal disunion, paralyzing our efforts, and wasting our energies; the fewness of those who share in works of piety or charity; our greediness of gain in order to minister to our luxuries; the indifference about holy things openly professed; the absence of any high standard or dislike to it; the appalling strides of a lawless infidelity; these and much besides are saddening proofs of a past and present winter; but the source of our hopes is not in ourselves; we seem ice-bound, but "He bloweth with His Spirit, and the

waters flow;" the clods of our valleys seem yet hard, but "He maketh it soft with the drops of rain, and blesseth the increase of it;" our hope is not in ourselves nor in men; but that the Lord of the Vineyard is "looking down" graciously "from heaven, beholding, and visiting this Vine, and the vineyard which His right hand planted, and the branch which He made strong for Himself,' and that it is He Who is "sending out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river." A high destiny seems to be yet in store for our Church; it is for her sake, we may hope, that her and our people are being carried into every corner of the world: certainly, to contrast her state, as she was towards the close of last century, without a single Bishop, out of these Islands, and as she now is every where in possession of her complete Apostolic constitution, though not in the degree she needs it, yet as centres from which she may spread, one has ground to hope that the "multiplying of the people" is to "increase her joy;" her Bishops shortly will be in every continent as well as in the isles afar off; her Episcopate (notwithstanding the sore blow which cut off her Irish Bishoprics) is already more than doubled; she is not dwindling, as sects after a time do, but growing; in the United States she has been quadrupled, while the population has doubled; she is there recognized even by those without her, as the only principle of stability in their land; hearts are turned unto her; some she has gathered

in; and it seems only a question of time, when the severed bodies shall be gathered into her, and it shall be seen, when she shall have enfolded the rest within her, which is indeed Moses' rod and given by God, which the formation of man; every step is an earnest of the final issue; it seems already to be felt extensively among them, that she alone is the bulwark against Romish errors, and they seem to be preparing to take refuge under her shadow.

And with this outward extension, she is every where giving signs of life; life in different forms, some regular, some irregular, more or less imperfect, yet still life; every where her members seem more alive to her true character, and so, we may trust, will more act up to it; and zeal, which has hitherto so often sought a vent without her, will be concentrated within her, and devote itself, in some allowed way, to remedy the great wants of our people; her prayers and Communions are again becoming more frequent; in some places, her two days of humiliation, her Litany days; elsewhere daily; her Communions are weekly in some places where they were monthly, and monthly Communions are becoming the ordinary provision even for her village Congregations; and with increased Communions, they who partake of them are increased also, and there is increased faith and sense of their value, and so, we may trust again, fresh life poured into the Church from the Fountain of life; her Lents and weekly fasts are more

observed, " self-denial (fasting) and almsgiving, the wings of prayer," are growing; her care for Christ's lambs, her thought of Christ's poor, (deficient as it yet is,) are increasing; there is (as you will have witnessed in this place) a more devout, an humbler spirit than heretofore, even at that most trying period of human life; the deposit of our Faith is more reverenced; there is a yearning after the holy days of the Church's " first" virgin " love;" our very divisions, we may hope, are marks of earnestness; persons whom I cannot but think to be partially in error, are in reality contending not for the error but for the truth, which is in their minds bound up with it, not against truth, but against some error which they have identified with others' statement of the truth. What God is preparing us for, for doing or for suffering, He only knoweth; yet one cannot but hope that He is preparing us for something; Romanists and Protestants alike have their eyes upon our Church; who knows but that for us may be reserved the office of " turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of the children to the fathers?" A thoughtful Romanist, lately, even when speaking against foreign Protestants, anticipated that if the Church were ever to be again one, it must be through our's, " which being both Catholic and Reformed, had her hands upon both." Only " it is not for" us " to know the times or the seasons which The Father hath put

in His own power;" much less to anticipate them. Enough that we "see our signs;" and that "the way in which we should go" is "made plain before our face." "A thousand years is with the Lord as one day," and He can make one day do the work of a thousand years. We have our office plainly marked out for us, (as has been often said,) to labour to act up to the principles of our Church, and to lead others to do the same; so shall we be formed, and aid (under the Divine grace) to form others in the mould, of "godliness, righteousness, and soberness of life," provided in her; we have but to seek to form ourselves and others in His holy Faith and the keeping of His commandments, and commit our Church and ourselves to Him, to deal with us, as in His Infinite Mercy He may vouchsafe. I cannot but hope, that they too, whose minds have been, from whatever cause, unsettled and tending to Romanism, will yet be stayed, and seeing the hand of God with our Church, "abide, wherein they have been called, with God," and forsake not the Church in which they were baptized, but await the end. Change from any Church is an act of solemn responsibility; much more would it be from one, to which, as our friend has developed, God has given the notes of "possession, freedom from party-titles, life, ancient descent, unbroken continuance, agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church[a];" much more

[a] British Critic, No. 53. Catholicity of the English Church.

still, when God's hand is visibly with her. To leave her at such a time might be a very wilful and presumptuous act, going, as far as man's wilfulness can, to oppose the Divine counsels and defeat His good purposes; it may be, perhaps, again true, "except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved." One must fear too, lest such, voluntarily foregoing the full use of the Holy Eucharist, as it is vouchsafed to them in their own Church, might provoke God to lessen His grace, as rejecting His Gifts. But, as I said, let us act up to the principles of our Church, and these brethren, who, from whatever excuse, have been allowed thus to be tempted of Satan to forsake the Church wherein God placed them, will be in less risk of being led into sin; their mother will not have to lament the loss of those whom she has nourished up and who may be valuable children to her.

It may be long ere the issue comes; at present, the course pointed out to the several Churches seems to be to amend themselves, to become again what they once were, even though imperfect; to "return to their first deeds;" so may they, through repentance and amendment of life, and keeping the commandments, be led to further knowledge of the truth, and in the end be restored to unity, if this blessing be yet in store for the Church. At least such seems the course which things, under God's guidance, are taking. Thus even the Greek Church is again become pro-

selytizing; the Gallican Church is sending out Missionaries and praying for our conversion, shewing her new life, in part, in seeking to extend her own Communion; in Prussia, religion is reviving in connection with Lutheran doctrine; we are being guided back to the principles of our Church; we seem thus to be taught, as our friend concisely said, that "we are to go back, not to go over;" repentance and zeal must come first, union afterwards; union is to be looked for, as God's gift, to be prayed for, not compassed by man's device; "it is God that maketh men to be of one mind in a house:" our duties then lie not now towards Rome; our present path and duties are plain;—with ourselves; to fit ourselves to be His instrument: how we may be employed, when fitted, we cannot foresee and so should not forestall; it may be that our first office will be, not with Rome, but with those bodies which were separated from Rome at the same time as ourselves, but were not so signally blessed and preserved; it may be, that through us what is lacking in them to the full gifts of a Church is to be supplied; it may be, that "our light shining before men," they are thus to be led to "glorify our Father which is in Heaven;" and thus we may be reunited with the rest of Christendom, not alone nor selfishly, but decked with the rich jewelry of them whom we have won back to Primitive Faith and Discipline. It may be too the very way, in which it may please God, that

the rest of the Church Catholic should be brought to love and respect, and seek to be one with, us, that we have aided to restore to Catholicity those who have gone away from it. Our office then is with ourselves and within ourselves, ready to do acts of charity to those severed from us, as far as we may without compromise, but not seeking untimely union. Such schemes have been baffled before, when things seemed most favourable, and so, a mark set upon them. As unity is perhaps a means to the greater holiness of the whole Church, so also holiness may be a condition of the restoration of unity. Let us act up to the principles of our Church, and realize her worship, her fastings, her repentance, her humiliations, her praise, her intercessions, her high standard of holy life, her exalted charity; live up to what is evidently Catholic in her; develope, as occasion requires, those Catholic points, which, though she has them, do not lie upon the surface; in a word, be raised to what our Church should be; and who knows but that He Who raises us up, may purify Rome too, and St. Peter be the type of the Church of St. Peter, and her Lord yet cast His gracious look upon her, and she weep bitterly her fall, and she, being "converted, strengthen" her "brethren," and deserve to be restored to the preeminence, which while she deserved, she had; and the Western Church be reunited, not on any plan of human wisdom, of compromise or concession, but in holiness

and Primitive Faith? Who knows, again, whether it may not be His gracious will to reunite His whole Church at once, and why should we then direct our eyes to the Western Church alone, which, even if united in itself, would yet remain sadly maimed, and sadly short of the Oneness she had in her best days, if she continued severed from the Eastern? After a long separation, in which we have not been known by name to the Eastern Church, much less our real character, God seems again to be opening to us ways of kindly intercourse with some portions of her, which must increase love, which will also, under God's blessing, help her to restore the holiness and knowledge of her early years, and therewith, make her wish to understand us better, and be united to us. All union of our distracted Christendom "is impossible with man; with God" it is as "possible," (and one may add it may be as likely to be His will,) to unite His whole Church in one, at once, whenever His time may be, as any single portions of it. We pray that God would "have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics, and fetch them home to His flock, that they may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one fold under One Shepherd:" why not hope, as we also continually pray, that the whole Church also may visibly become such a fold? that God would "inspire His universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord?" Such longings, (ac-

cording to the heads of good Bishop Andrews' daily intercession,) for the good estate of the "Church Catholic; Eastern; Western; our own," as they set before us a nobler end, so are they more accordant with our Church's feelings as expressed in her Liturgy, and they are safer. The Church Catholic can only be re-united on Catholic principles; the very thought and longing carries us back to her pure days and her Œcumenical Councils, and primitive faith and holiness; it awakens our sympathies only for an object upon which they may rest without risk. On the other hand, longing for re-union with any branch of the Church, as the Roman, naturally tends to make man gloss over the difficulties, and shut their eyes to the actual corruptions, which we should now be called upon to recognise or to sanction; it creates sympathies not for her, as she once was, a "pure Virgin," but for her very defilements: the very fact, that it seems more within the compass of human means, tends to make men impatient of hindrances, which it seems as though God had placed, and desirous to remove them or set them aside in an unholy way. Let us long, not for what may be brought about by a mere blending of our own practical unholiness and short-comings with the corruptions of another Church, thereby to aggravate in the sight of God the very offensiveness of what is severally amiss in us; but rather let us long for what, being evidently beyond the reach of man's device, leads us at once

to the throne of God, thence to expect it from the Great Head of the Church as He would give it, in holiness and holy love. We know not what may be, and so our duty is the easier, not to act as though we knew it; rather to "do with all our might what our hand" now "findeth to do," not to run before, but to follow after; not to plan or devise for ourselves, but to act where God leads. Be we zealous, earnest, patient, humble; "He Who cometh will come, and will not tarry;" and it may be, "His kingdom" will sooner "come," if we in our Church follow His gracious guidance.

May God give us grace, in these difficult days, more and more "perfectly to know His Son Jesus Christ to be the Way, the Truth, and the Life, that following the steps of His holy Apostles—we may stedfastly walk in the way that leadeth to eternal life, through the same His Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

Ever your very affectionate Friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church,
Feast of S. Philip and S. James,
1841.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A. *page* 109.

Archbishop Ussher on the difference between ancient and modern Invocation of Saints, from his Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge, p. 445 sqq.

"—That we may the better understand, and more distinctly apprehend, how far the recommending of men's selves unto the prayers of the Saints, which began to be used in the latter end of the fourth age after Christ, came short of that invocation of Saints, which is at this day practised in the Church of Rome: these special differences may be observed betwixt the one and the other.

"First, in those elder times, he that prayed silently was thought to honour God in a singular manner; as one that 'brought[a] faith with him, and confessed that God was the searcher of the heart and reins and heard his prayer, before it was poured out of his mouth;' the understanding of the present secrets of the heart, by the general judgment of the Fathers, being[b] no more communicated by Him unto the creatures, than the knowledge of things to come; for before the Day wherein the secrets of the heart shall be manifested, 'Almighty[c] God alone doth behold the hidden things,' saith St. Hierome, alleging for proof of this, the text Matt. 6, 4. 'Thy Father That seeth in secret;' Psalm 7, 9. 'God searcheth the hearts and reins;' and 1 Kings 8, 39. 'Thou only knowest the hearts of all the children of men;' but now in the Church of Rome mental prayers are presented to the Saints as well as vocal, and they are believed to receive both the one and the other.

"Secondly, in the former times[d] it was a great question, whether at all, or how far, or after what manner, the spirits of the dead did know the things that concerned us here: and con-

[a] Amb. de Sacr. vi. 4.

[b] Quæstt. ad Antioch. ap. Ath. t. 2. p. 303.

[c] Hier. l. 5. in Ezech. c. 16. l. 4. in Ezech. c. 14. l. 4. in Jerem. c. 20. l. 1. in Matt. c. 9. Chrys. in Matt. Hom. 29. Gennad. de Eccl. dogm. c. 81. Cass. Collat. 7. c. 13. Sedul. in Rom. 2. Paschas. de Sp. S. ii. 1; et alios passim.

[d] Aug. in Ps. 108. enarr. 1.

sequently, whether they pray for us only 'in[e] general,' and for the particulars God answereth us according to our several necessities, where, when, and after what manner He pleaseth. Anselmus Laudunensis, in his interlineal gloss upon that text, 'Abraham is ignorant of us and Israel knoweth us not,' (Is. 63, 16.) noteth that Augustine saith, that 'the dead, even the Saints, do not know what the living do, no not their own sons.' And indeed St. Augustine in his book of the care for the dead[f], maketh this inference upon that place of Scripture. 'If such great Patriarchs as these were ignorant, what was done to the people that descended from them, unto whom (believing God) the people itself was promised to come from their stock; how do the dead interpose themselves in knowing and furthering the things and acts of the living?' and afterwards draweth these conclusions from thence, which Hugo[g] de Sancto Victore, borrowing from him, hath inserted into his book De spiritu et anima, cap. 29. 'The[h] spirits of the dead be there, where they do neither see nor hear the things that are done or fall out to men in this life[i].' 'Yet have they such a care of the living, although they know not at all what they do, as we have care of the dead, although we know not what they do.' 'The[j] dead indeed do not know what is done here while it is here in doing: but afterward they may hear it by such as die and go unto them from hence; yet not altogether, but as much as is permitted to the one to tell, fit for the other to hear. They may know it also by the angels, which be here present with us and carry our souls unto them, they may know also by the revelation of God's Spirit such of the things done here which is necessary for them to know.'—

And then having further shewn that Gratian (Decr. p. 2. caus. 3. qu. 2. c. 29.) holds that the saints do not know what is done here; that P. Lombard holds it not *incredible* that they do, and that "our petitions are made known to them in the Word of God which they contemplate, (l. iv. dist. 45.) that Scotus (ib. q. 4.) and Gab.

[e] Aug. de Cur. pro Mort. c. 16. "That the Saints in general are concerned for the Church, and can pray, and do in fact pray for it, is confessed by Melancthon, (Conf. Aug. art. de Invoc. Sanct.) Brentius, (Conf. Wirtemb. c. de Inv. Sanct.) Chemnitz (Exam. Conc. Trid. c. 3). Calvin also (Inst. 3. 20, 21, and 24) is not opposed to this opinion." Bellar. de Missâ, ii. 8.

[f] c. 13.

[g] Lib. de Sp. et An. t. 3. Op. Aug. qui id. est cum l. 2. de Anim. inter. Op. Hug. Vict.

[h] In de Cur. pro Mort. c. 13. [the book is later than both, containing extracts from both, see Aug. Opp. t. vi. App. p. 39. ed. Ben. The passages alleged by Abp. Ussher are from a genuine work.]

[i] Ib. c. 14.

[j] Ib. c. 15.

Biel. (in Can. Miss. lect. 21.) hold it" *probable* that God specially reveals to them prayers made to them, he thus contrasts the positiveness of later writers.

Cardinal Bellarmine[k] supposeth, that 'if the Saints should have need thus of a new revelation, the Church would not so boldly say unto all the Saints, 'Pray for us,' but would sometime entreat of God[l], that he would reveal our prayers unto them.' Yet because 'it seemeth unto him superfluous to desire ordinarily of them that they should pray for us, which cannot ordinarily understand what we do in particular, but know only in general that we are exposed to many dangers;' he resolveth, that, 'although[m] there may be some doubt, in what manner the Saints may know things that be absent, and which are sometimes delivered by the affection of the heart alone; yet it is certain that they do know them.' 'And you must note,' says Dr. Pesantius[n], 'that this is to be held for a point of faith, that the Saints do know the prayers, which we pour unto them, *because* otherwise they should be made in vain.' So that to make good the Popish manner of praying unto Saints, that which was at the first but probable and problematical, must now be held to be *de fide* and an undoubted axiom of divinity.

"Thirdly, in the Popish invocation, formal and absolute prayers are tendered to the Saints, but the compellations of them used at first, were commonly either wishes only or requests of the same nature with those which are in this kind usually made unto the living; where the requester is oftentimes superior to him whose prayers he desireth, (which standeth not well with the condition of prayer properly so called,) and they that are requested, be evermore accounted in the number of those that pray for us, but none of those that are prayed unto by us. Of this you may hear, if you please, what one of the more moderate Romanists writeth. 'If[o] it were lawful for the Prophet to call to the Angels and the whole host of Heaven, and to exhort them that they would praise God, which notwithstanding they do continually without any one admonishing them, whereby nothing else but a certain abundance of desire of the amplifying of God's glory is declared: why may it not be lawful also out of a certain abundance of godly desire to call upon those blessed spirits which by the society of the same body are conjoined with us; and to exhort them, that they should do that, which we believe they otherwise do of themselves?' That to say, 'All ye

[k] De Eccl. Triumph. l. 1. c. 20.
[l] Id. de Purg. 2. 15.
[m] l. 1. c. 20. ut sup.
[n] In 1. pt. Thom. Quæst. 12. art. 10. Disp. 7. Conc. 6.
[o] G. Cassand. Schol. in Hymn. Eccl. Op. p. 224.

Saints, pray unto God for me;' should import as much, as if it were said, 'Would to God, that all the Saints did pray unto God for me!' 'I wish earnestly that all the Saints should pray to God for me.' Thus writeth Cassander, in his notes upon the ancient ecclesiastical hymns, published by him in the year 1556, who being challenged for this by some others of that side, added this further to give them better satisfaction, 'When[p] I did see that it was not necessary that we should hold that the Saints do understand our prayers; I thought it was sufficient to put back the calumnies of some, if we should say that these interpellations might be expounded by way of wishing or desiring: which hath less absurdity in it, and is agreeable to the examples of the holy Scriptures. But if any man would have such compellations as these to be taken also for an intimation of the desire, and a direct speaking unto them, I do not gainsay it. Notwithstanding I would think that a tacit condition ought to be understood in such an intimation: such as Gregory Nazianzen doth express in the formal oration of his sister Gorgonia when he saith, if thou hast any care at all of our speeches, and holy souls receive this honour from God, that they have notice of such things as these, do thou accept this oration of ours.'

Then, having shewn that even "in the very darkest times of the Papacy" "some famous men" were related to have thought such prayers superfluous, "many" that they were only prayers to God "that the merits of the Saints may help us," not properly to themselves, he adds a

"Fourth difference betwixt the Popish prayers and the interpellations used in the ancient time. For by the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome, the Saints in Heaven are not only made joint petitioners with us, (as the Saints are upon earth,) but also our attorneys and advocates; who carry the suit for us, not by the pleading of Christ's merits alone, but by bringing in their own merits likewise, upon the consideration of the dignity or condignity whereof it is believed, that God yieldeth to the motions they make unto Him on our behalf. 'We[q] pray unto the Saints (saith the Master of the Sentences) that they may intercede for us, that is to say, that their merits may help us, and that they may will our good; for they willing it, God doth will it, and so it will be effected.' 'We ought to intreat the Apostles and the other Saints (saith Hugo[r] de Prato) in all our necessities; because they are our advocates and the means

[p] Id. Ep. 19. ad Molin. p. 1109.
[q] Petr. Lombard. Sent. l. 4. Dist. 45. and Jacob. de Vitriac. in Lit. maj.
[r] Serm. 35.

betwixt us and God, by whom God hath ordained to bestow all things upon us.' 'Because it is a thing fitting,' (saith Scotus[s],) 'that he that is in bliss should be a coadjutor with God in procuring the salvation of the elect according to such manner as this may agree unto him; and to this it is requisite that our prayers, which are offered unto him, should especially be revealed unto him, because they lean especially upon the merits of him as of a mediator bringing us to the salvation which is sought for; therefore it is probable that God doth specially reveal unto him that is in bliss such of our prayers as are offered unto him or unto God in his name.' But this is an open derogation to the high prerogative of our Saviour's meritorious intercession, and a manifest encroachment upon the great office of mediation, which the most religious and learned among those Fathers, who desired to be recommended unto the prayers of the Saints, were so careful to preserve entire unto Him. 'For what is so proper to Christ,' saith S. Ambrose[t], 'as to stand by God the Father for an Advocate of the people?' 'He is the Priest,' saith S. Augustin[u], 'who being now entered within the veil, Alone there of them that have been partakers of the flesh, doth make intercession for us.'—

"Fifthly, the recommendation of men's selves unto the prayers of the Saints deceased, which was at first admitted in the ancient Church, did no way impeach the confidence and boldness which we have gotten in Christ, to make our immediate approach to the throne of Grace; which by the invocation of Saints, now taught in the Church of Rome, is very much impaired. For to induce men to the practice of this, the great Majesty of God and the severity of His justice is propounded unto poor sinners on the one hand, and the consideration of their own baseness and unworthiness on the other. Whereupon it is inferred, that as well for the manifesting their reverence for God's Majesty, as the testifying of their submissness and humility, they should seek to God by the mediation of His Saints; like as men do seek unto the king by the mediation of his servants. Which motives can have no more force to encourage men to the invocation of Saints, than they have to discharge them from the immediate invocation of God and His Christ. So among the causes alleged by Alexander of Hales[x], why we ought to pray unto the Saints; one is 'in respect of our want in contemplating, that we who are not able to behold the highest Light in Itself, may contemplate it in His Saints;' another 'in respect of our 'want in loving: because we miserable men (miserable men indeed that do so) or some of us, at least, are more affected

[s] In 4. Sent. Dist. 45. Quæst. 4.
[t] In Ps. 39.
[u] In Ps. 64.
[x] Summ. pt. 4. Quæst. 26. memb. 3. art. 5.

sometimes unto some Saint, than unto our Lord Himself; and therefore God, having compassion on our misery, is pleased that we should pray unto His Saints;' and a third 'in respect of the reverence of God; that a sinner who hath offended God, because he dareth not to come unto Him in his own person, may have recourse unto the Saints by imploring their patronage.' The like we read in Gabriel Biel[y], handling the same argument. 'This is a singular consolation (saith he) to sinners, who have oftentimes more mind to the interpellation of the Saints than of the Judge: whose defect of holiness also, other men's goodness is able to supply:' and it maketh[z] 'for the reverence of God, that a sinner who hath offended God, as it were, not daring for the dross of his sin to appear in his proper person, before the most high and dreadful Majesty, should have recourse unto the Saints, who are most pure and grateful to God: who may present the sinner's prayers unto the Most High, and by adjoining their merits and prayers thereunto, might make the same more fit for the audience, more pleasing and more grateful.' Therefore, Salmeron[a], the Jesuit, sticketh not to deliver his opinion plainly; that the praying unto God by the Saints seemeth to him better than the praying unto Him immediately, as for other reasons, 'so because the Church, which hath the Spirit of Christ; (though St. Augustine surely would have judged such a Church to have been led by the spirit of Antichrist rather than of Christ;) 'most frequently hath recourse unto God by the Saints, but cometh more rarely unto God by itself;' and also because the praying of God by the invocation of Saints doth argue greater humility; as may be seen in the Centurion, (Luke 7, 6. 7.)' whereunto he applieth also the saying of David, 'He hath had a respect to the prayer of the humble, and did not despise their prayers[b];' and of Judith, 'The prayer of the humble and meek hath always pleased Thee.'

"Thus in the days of the Apostles themselves, under the pretence of humility[c], some laboured to bring into the Church 'the worshipping of Angels,' which carried with it 'a shew of wisdom,' (as St. Paul speaketh of it,) and such a shew as was not far unlike unto that wherewith our Romish Doctors do cozen simple people nowadays. 'For this' (saith Theodoret[d]) 'did they counsel should be done,' (namely, that men should pray unto Angels,) 'pretending humility, and saying that the God of all things was invisible and inaccessible and incomprehensible,

y In Canon. Miss. Lect. 30.
z Lect. 31.
a In 1 Tim. 2. Disp. 7. sect. ult.
b Ps. 102, 17. Judith 9, 16.
c Coloss. 2, 18. 23.
d In Col. 2.

and that it was fit we should procure God's favour by the means of angels,' whereas St. Chrysostom [e], treating of Christian humility, sheweth that the faithful who are furnished with that grace, do notwithstanding 'ascend beyond the highest tops of heaven, and passing by the Angels present themselves before the regal throne itself.—

"Sixthly, The Romanists repose such confidence in the intercession of the saints, that they look to receive far greater benefit by them, than by their own prayers. Which conceit how distasteful it was to the ancient Doctors, St. Chrysostom [f] may be a sufficient witness, who laboured exceedingly to root out this erroneous opinion, when it first began to shew itself in his time. And therefore he is bold to affirm, not only that we have no such needs of others, that we may entreat by them, but also that God then doth most, when we do not use the entreaties of others.—

"Seventhly and principally it is to be considered, that invocation is attributed to Saints in the Church of Rome as a part of the worship due unto them: yea as eximium adorationis genus, (for so doth Cardinal Bellarmine [g] pronounce it to be,) 'an eminent kind of adoration.' For 'we do not honour the Saints' (saith Azorius [h] the Jesuit) 'with that worship only wherewith we do men that excel in virtue, wisdom, power, or any other dignity, but also with Divine worship and honour which is an act of Religion. For that worship which is given to men of excellency, is an act and office not of Religion, but of another inferior virtue, which is called observance.' And whereas it is as clear as the noonday, that the giving of divine honour and worship unto any creature is flat idolatry, the poor man weeneth that he and his fellows may be excused from being idolaters, because they do not give divine worship and honour unto the Saints for themselves, but for God Who hath made them Saints: as if God, Who cannot endure that His glory should be given unto another, would be mocked with such toys as these. Indeed they were wont heretofore to delude men commonly with an idle distinction of Dulia and Latria [i], but now, 'it [k] is the opinion of the most and the wisest of them, that it is one and the selfsame virtue of Religion which containeth both Latria and Dulia.' Whereas it hath been the constant doctrine of the ancient Church, that all religious worship (whereof prayer by the judgment of all men, as well Heathen as Christian, hath been always esteemed to be an

[e] In Matt. Hom. 65.
[f] In Act. 16. Hom. 36.
[g] Præf. in Controv. de Eccl. Triumph.
[h] Instt. Mor. t. 1. l. ix. c. 10.
[i] They are used as equivalent, Constt. Ap. iii. 7.
[k] Nic. Serarius Litaneut. 2. q. 27. fin.

especial part) is so properly due to God Alone, that without committing of idolatry it cannot be communicated to any creature. For 'in the Catholic Church it is divinely and singularly delivered, that no creature is to be worshipped by the soul, but He only Who is the Creator of all things,' saith St. Augustine[k]. And therefore the ancient Doctors, who thought it not amiss that men should recommend themselves unto the prayers of the Saints departed, held it a thing intolerable notwithstanding, to impart unto any man or angel the worship of invocation. For to request the help of the prayers of our fellow servants is one thing, and to worship them with the service of invocation is another; as may be seen in the case of our brethren here on earth, who may not refuse the former without the violation of charity, nor accept the latter at our hands without an open breach of piety.

"Now that the Fathers judged no otherwise of prayer than hath been said, this may be one good argument; that when they define it, they do it with express reference to God and no other, as may be seen in those five several definitions thereof which Bellarmine himself repeateth out of them.

Then, having set these down, and having shewn that the Council of Laodicea anathematized such as invocated Angels[l], and produced sayings from the Fathers to the effect that God only is to be invocated, and "condemning the worship of Angels or any other creature whatsoever," he gives the following sad details from the later ages, and these the more melancholy, since they are not obscure individuals, but men great in their day, who so speak, evidencing how deeply seated these corruptions were in the later Church;

'There[m] wanted not such as would interpret that speech of the Angel unto the holy Virgin, 'Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee:' of the equality of her empire with her Son's; as if it had been said, 'Even as He, so thou also dost enjoy the same most excellent dignity of ruling. In[n] the redundance and effusion of grace upon the creatures, the Lord's power and will are so accommodated unto thine, that thou mightest seem to be the first in that both diadem and tribunal. The Lord is with thee: not so much thou with the Lord, as the Lord is with thee, in that function.' Then it was taught for good Divinity, that 'from[o] the time wherein the Virgin-mother did conceive in her womb

[k] De quant. anim. c. 34. add de mor. Eccl. Cath. c. 30.

[l] The Latin Canonists substituted "angulos" for angelos."

[m] Eman. de Valle de Moura S.T.P. ac Inquisit. Deputatus, Opusc. 1. de Incantat. 1. Ensalmis, s. 1. c. 1. n. 46.

[n] Ib.

[o] Bern. Sen. Serm. 61. art. 1, c. 8.

the Word of God, she hath obtained such a kind of jurisdiction (so to speak) or authority in all the temporal procession of the Holy Ghost, that no creature hath obtained any grace or virtue from God, but according to the dispensation of His holy Mother;" that "because[p] she is the Mother of the Son of God Who doth produce the Holy Ghost, therefore all the gifts, virtues and graces of the Holy Ghost are by her hands administered to whom she pleaseth, how she pleaseth, and as much as she pleaseth." That she[q] hath singularly obtained of God this office from eternity; as herself doth testify, Prov. viii. 23. 'I was ordained from everlasting,' namely, a dispenser of celestial graces; and that in[r] this respect, Cant. vii. 4. it is said of her, 'Thy neck is a tower of ivory,' because that as by the neck the vital spirits do descend from the head into the body; so by the Virgin the vital graces are transmitted from Christ the Head into His mystical body, the fulness of grace being in Him, as in the head from whence the influence cometh, and in her as in the neck through which it is transfused unto us; so that take away the patronage of the Virgin, you stop as it were the sinner's breath that he is not able to live any longer.

"Then men stuck not to teach, that unto her "all[t] power was given in heaven and in earth." So that for "heaven" when our Saviour ascended thither, this might be assigned for one reason (among others) why He left His mother behind Him, "lest[u] perhaps the Court of Heaven might have been in a doubt whom they should rather go to meet, their Lord or their Lady;" and for "earth" she[x] might rightly apply unto herself that in the first of Ezra "all the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord given unto me." And we may say unto her again that in Tobit xiii. "Thy kingdom endureth for all ages." And in the cxliv. or cxlv. Psalm, "Thy kingdom is a kingdom of all ages." That howsoever she was "the[y] noblest person that was or ever should be in the World, and of so great perfection, that although she had not been the Mother of God, she ought nevertheless to have been the Lady of the world; yet according to the laws whereby the world is governed, by the right of inheritance she did deserve the principality and king-

[p] Id. ib.

[q] Id. ib. art. 3. c. 3.

[r] Id. ib. art. 1. c. 8. art. 2. c. 10. ex Pseudo-Hieron. Serm. de Assumpt. Mariæ. Jo. Herolt. in Serm. Discip. de Temp. Serm. 163. Blas. Viegas in Apoc. c. 12. Comm. 2. s. 10. n. 1. 2.

[s] Viegas, ib. s. 2. n. 6.

[t] P. Damian. Serm. 1. de Nat. B. Mariæ. t. 5. Surii Sept. 8.

[u] Anselm de Excell. B. Virg. c. 7. and following him, Bern. de Bust. in Mariali, p. 11. Serm. 1. p. 3. and Seb. Barrad. Jesuit. Conc. Evang. vi. 11.

[x] Bern. de Bust. l. c. pt. 12. Serm. 1. pt. 1.

[y] Bern. Sen. Serm. 61. art. 1. c. 7.

dom of this world." That "Christ[m] never made any legacy of His Monarchy: because that could not be done without the prejudice of His Mother; and He knew besides that the Mother could make void the Testament of the Son, if it were made unto her prejudice. And therefore that by all this it appeareth most evidently, that Mary the Mother of Jesus by right of inheritance hath the regal dominion over all that be under God." That "as[n] many creatures do serve the glorious Virgin Mary, as serve the Trinity. Namely, all creatures, whatsoever degree they hold among the things created (whether they be spiritual as angels, or rational as men, or corporal as the heavenly bodies or the elements) and all things that are in heaven or in earth, whether they be the damned or the blessed; all which being brought under the government of God, are subject likewise unto the glorious Virgin, forasmuch as He Who is the Son of God and of the blessed Virgin, being willing as it were to equal in some sort His Mother's sovereignty unto the sovereignty of His Father, even He Who was God did serve His Mother upon earth. Whence Luke ii. 51. it is written of the Virgin and glorious Joseph: 'He was subject unto them,' that as the proposition is true, All things are subject to God's command, even the Virgin herself: so this again is true also, All things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God Himself." That "considering[o] the blessed Virgin is the Mother of God and God is her Son, and every son is naturally inferior to his mother, and subject unto her, and the mother hath preeminence and is superior to her son; it therefore followeth that the blessed Virgin is superior to God, and God Himself is subject unto her in respect of the Manhood which He assumed from her," that "howsoever[p] she be subject unto God inasmuch as she is a creature: yet is she said to be superior and preferred before Him, inasmuch as she is His Mother."

"Then men were put in mind that "by[q] sinning after Baptism they seemed to contemn and despise the Passion of Christ: and so that no sinner doth deserve that Christ should any more make intercession for him to the Father: without whose intercession none can be delivered either from the eternal punishment or the temporal, nor from the fault which he hath voluntarily committed. And therefore that it was necessary that Christ should constitute His well-beloved Mother a Mediatrix betwixt us and Him," "and[r] so in this our pilgrimage there is no other

[m] Id. ib.
[n] Id. ib. c. 6.
[o] Bern. de Bust. Marial. p. 9. Serm. 2.
[p] Id. p. 2. Serm. 2.
[q] Jac. de Valent. Episc. Christopol. in expos. Cant. V. Mariæ Magnificat.
[r] Id. ib.

refuge left unto us in our tribulations and adversities but to have recourse unto the Virgin Mary our Mediatrix; that she would appease the wrath of her Son." That "as[s] He is ascended into heaven to appear in the sight of God for men; (Heb. ix. 24.) so she ought to ascend thither to appear in the sight of her Son for sinners; that so mankind might have always before the face of God, a help like unto Christ for the procuring of his salvation." That "this[t] Empress is of so great authority in the palace of Heaven, that it is lawful to appeal unto her from any grievance, all other intermedial Saints omitted."—"That[u] she is a Chancellor in the court of heaven, and giveth letters of mercy only in this present life; but for the souls that depart from hence, unto some letters of pure grace, unto others of simple justice, and unto some mixed of justice and grace. For some (say they) were much devoted unto her: and unto them she giveth letters of pure grace, whereby she commandeth glory to be given them, without any pain of Purgatory. Others were miserable sinners and not devoted to her; and unto them she giveth letters of simple justice, whereby she commandeth that condign punishment be taken of them. Others were lukewarm and remiss in devotion; and to them she giveth letters of justice and grace together: whereby she commandeth that both favour be done unto them, and yet some pain of Purgatory be inflicted upon them for their negligence and sluggishness." And these things they say "are signified in Queen Esther; who wrote letters that the Jews should be saved, and the enemies should be killed, and to the poor small gifts should be given." Yea further also, where[x] King Ahasuerus did proffer unto the said Esther even the half of his kingdom, (Esther v. 3.) thereby (they say) was signified that God bestowed half of His Kingdom upon the blessed Virgin. "That having justice and mercy as the chiefest goods of His Kingdom, He retained Justice unto Himself, and granted Mercy unto her:" and "therefore[y] that if a man do find himself aggrieved in the Court of God's Justice, he may appeal to the Court of Mercy of His Mother," she being that 'throne of grace' whereof the Apostle speaketh (Heb. iv. 16.), 'Let us go boldly unto the throne[z] of Grace, that we may receive Mercy, and find Grace to help in time of need.' They tell us that[a] it is for the ornament of an earthly Kingdom, that

[s] Bern. de Bust. Marial. p. 11. Serm. 2. memb. 1.
[t] Id. p. 3. Serm. 3. in Excell. 4.
[u] Id. p. 12. Serm. 2. memb. 1. in. Excell. 22.
[x] Gabr. Biel. in Can. Missæ. lect. 80. vid. Joh. Gerson. tract 4. sup. Magnificat.
[y] Bern. de Bust. Marial. p. 3. Serm. 3. in Excell. 4.
[z] Id. ib. Exc. 5. and p. 5. Serm. 7. in fin.
[a] Id. p. 9. Serm. 2.

it should have both a King and a Queen, and therefore when any king hath not a wife, his subjects often do request him to take one. Hereupon they say, that the eternal King and omnipotent Emperor, minding to adorn the kingdom of Heaven above, did frame this blessed Virgin, to the end He might make her the lady and Empress of His kingdom and empire; that the prophecy of David might be verified, saying unto her in the Psalm: 'Upon Thy right hand did stand the Queen in clothing of gold.' That "she[b] is an Empress because she is the spouse of the eternal Emperor: of Whom it is said, (John iii. 29.) He that hath the Bride is the Bridegroom, and that when God did deliver unto her the empire of the world and all the things contained therein, He said unto her that which we read in the first of the Æneids:

> His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono;
> Imperium sine fine dedi.

"That she is "the Empress[c] also of heaven and earth, because she did bear the heavenly Emperor; and therefore that she can ask of Him what she will, and obtain it. That this was figured in the history of the Kings, where the mother of Solomon said unto him: 'I desire one petition of thee, do not confound my face:' for then should He confound her face if He did deny that which she requested;" and that "if in respect of her maternal jurisdiction she hath command of her Son Who was subject unto her: (as we read, Luke ii. 51.) then much more hath she command over all the creatures that are subject to her Son." That "this[d] mighty God did (as far as He might) make His Mother partner of His Divine Majesty and power; giving unto her of old the sovereignty both of celestial things and mortal; ordering at her pleasure (as the patronage of men did require) the earth, the seas; Heaven and Nature; at her liking, and by her, bestowing on mortal men His Divine treasures and heavenly gifts. So as all might understand that whatsoever doth flow into the earth from that eternal and glorious fountain of good things, doth flow by Mary." That "she[e] is constituted over every creature; and whosoever boweth his knee unto Jesus, doth fall down also and supplicate unto His Mother; so that the glory of the Son may be judged, not so much to be common with the Mother as to be the very same." That

[b] Id. P. 3. Serm. 3. Excell. 4.
[c] Id. Ib.
[d] Horat. Turselin. Jesuit. and in Ep. Dedic. Hist. Lauret. ad Card. Aldobrandinum.
[e] Arnold. Carnot. Tract. de Laud. Virg.

" so[f] great is her glory that she exceedeth the nature of Angels and men joined together, as far in glory, as the circumference of the firmament exceedeth his centre in magnitude, when she understandeth herself in her Son to be, as His other self, clothed with the Deity." That she being " the Mother[g] of God doth assume unto herself of the omnipotency of her Son (upon which she leaneth) as much as she pleaseth." And that she " doth[h] come before the golden altar of human reconciliation not intreating only but commanding; a Mistress, not a Maid." They tell us that the blessed Virgin herself appeared once unto Thomas Becket and used this speech unto him, " Rejoice[i] and be glad and be joyful with me: because my glory doth excel the dignity and joy of all the Saints and all the blessed spirits; and I alone have greater glory than all the Angels and Saints together. Rejoice, because that as the Sun doth enlighten the day and the world, so my brightness doth enlighten the whole celestial world. Rejoice, because the whole host of Heaven obeyeth me, reverenceth and honoureth me. Rejoice, because my Son is always obedient unto me and my will, and all my prayers He always heareth." (Or as others[k] do relate it, " The will of the Blessed Trinity and mine is one and the same; and whatsoever doth please me the whole Trinity with unspeakable favour doth give consent unto.") " Rejoice, because God doth always at my pleasure reward my servitors in this world, and in the world to come. Rejoice, because I sit next to the holy Trinity, and am clothed with my body glorified. Rejoice, because I am certain and sure that these my joys shall always stand, and never be finished or fail. And whosoever by rejoicing with these spiritual joys shall worship me in this world, at the time of the departure of his soul out of the body, he shall obtain my presence; and I will deliver his soul from the malignant enemies, and present it in the sight of my Son, that it may possess joys with me." They tell us that " many (many whores[l] for example, that would not sin on Saturday for the reverence of the Virgin, whatsoever they did on the Lord's day) seem to have the blessed Virgin in greater veneration than Christ her Son; moved thereunto out of simplicity more than out of knowledge. Yet that the Son of God doth bear with the simplicity of these men and women, because He is not ignorant that the honour of the Mother doth redound to the Child." (Prov. xvii. 6.) They argue further that " if[m] a Cardinal have this

[f] Bern. de Bust. Marial. P. 12. Serm. 2. Excell. 21.
[g] Id. P. 12. Serm. 2. Excell. 28.
[h] P. Damian. Serm. 1. de Nat. B. Mariæ.
[i] Bern. de Bust. Marial. P. 20. Serm. 2. sect. ult.
[k] Promptuar. Discipuli de Miraculis B. Mariæ, Exempl. 14. p. 8. ed. Mogunt. 1612.
[l] Bern. de Bust. P. 6. Serm. 2. Memb. 3.
[m] Id. P. 12. Serm. 1. Memb. 3.

privilege, that if he put his cap upon the head of one that is led unto justice, he is freed thereby: then by an argument drawn from the stronger, the cloak of the blessed Virgin is able to deliver us from all evil, her mercy being so large, that if she should see any man who did devoutly make her crown (that is to say, repeat the rosary or chaplet of prayers made for her worship) to be drawn unto punishment in the midst of a thousand devils; she would presently rescue him, and not permit that any one should have an evil end, who did study reverently to make her crown." They add moreover, that "for[i] every of these crowns a man shall obtain 273758 days of indulgence: and that Pope Sixtus the Fourth granted an indulgence of 12,000 years for every time that a man in the state of grace should repeat this short orizon or salutation of the Virgin, which by many is inserted into her crowns. 'Hail, most holy Mary, the mother of God, the queen of Heaven, the gate of Paradise, the Lady of the world. Thou art a singular and pure Virgin: thou didst conceive Christ without sin: thou didst bear the Creator and Saviour of the world, in Whom I do not doubt. Deliver me from all evil, and pray for my sins. Amen.'" In the crowns composed by Bonaventure, this is one of the orizons that is prescribed to be said, 'O[k] Empress, and our most kind Lady, by the authority of a mother command thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that He would vouchsafe to lift up our minds from the love of earthly unto heavenly desires;' which is suitable to that versicle, which we read in the 35th Psalm of this Lady's Psalter; 'Incline[l] the countenance of God upon us, compel Him to have mercy upon sinners,' the harshness whereof our Romanists have a little qualified in some of their editions, reading thus, "Incline[m] the countenance of thy Son upon us, compel Him by thy prayers to have mercy upon us sinners." The Psalms of this Psalter do all of them begin as David's do, but with this main difference, that where the Prophet in the one aimeth at the advancement of the honour of our Lord, the Friar in the other applieth all to the magnifying of the power and goodness of our Lady. So in the first Psalm: Blessed is the man (quoth Bonaventure) that loveth thy name, O Virgin Mary, thy grace shall comfort his soul; and in the others following; Lady[n], how are they multiplied that trouble me? with thy tempest shalt thou persecute and scatter them. Lady[o], suffer me not to be rebuked in the fury of God, nor to be judged in His wrath. My Lady[p], in thee have I put my trust: deliver me from my enemies,

[i] Ib. [k] Bonaventura Corona B. M. V. Opp. t. 6. Romæ, 1588.
[l] Psalt. B. M. V. 26. [m] Psalt. Bonaventuræ seorsim editæ. Paris. 1596, in Capeleto Dominicæ 2. [n] Ps. 3. [o] Ps. 6. [p] Ps. 7.

O Lady. In our Lady[p] put I my trust; for the sweetness of the mercy of her name. How[q] long wilt thou forget me, O Lady, and not deliver me in the day of tribulation? Preserve[r] me, O Lady, for in thee have I put my trust: and impart unto me the drops of thy grace. I[s] will love thee, O Lady of heaven and earth, and I will call upon thy name among the nations. 'The heavens[t] declare thy glory: and the fragrance of thine ointments is spread among the nations.' Hear[u] us, Lady, in the day of trouble; and turn thy merciful face unto our prayers. Unto thee[x], O Lady, have I lifted up my soul: in the judgment of God, by thy prayers, I shall not be ashamed. Judge me[y], Lady, for I have departed from my innocency, but because I will trust in thee, I shall not be weakened. In thee[z], O Lady, have I put my trust, let me never be confounded: in thy favour receive me. Blessed[a] are they whose hearts do love thee, O Virgin Mary; their sins by thee shall mercifully be washed away. Lady[b], judge those that hurt me: and rise up against them and plead my cause. Waiting[c] have I waited for thy grace; and thou hast done unto me according to the multitude of the mercy of thy name. Lady[d], thou art our refuge in all our necessities; and the powerful strength treading down the enemy. Have mercy[e] upon me, O Lady, who art called the mother of mercy, and according to the bowels of thy mercies, cleanse me from all mine iniquities. Save me[f], Lady, by thy name and deliver me from mine unrighteousness. Have mercy[g] upon me, O Lady, have mercy upon me: because my heart is prepared to search out thy will, and in the shadow of thy wings will I rest. Let[h] Mary arise; and let her enemies be scattered: let them all be trodden down under her feet. In thee[i], O Lady, have I put my trust, let me never be put to confusion: deliver me in thy mercy, and cause me to escape. Give[k] the King thy judgment, O God, and thy mercy to the Queen His Mother. Lady[l], the Gentiles are come into the inheritance of God, whom thou by thy merits hast confederated unto Christ. Thy mercies[m], O Lady, will I sing for ever. God[n] is the Lord of revenges, but thou the mother of mercy dost bow Him to take pity. O come[o] let us sing unto our Lady; let us make a joyful noise to Mary, our Queen, that brings salvation. O sing[p] unto our Lady a new song, for she hath done marvellous things. O[q] give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good: give thanks unto His Mother, for her mercy endureth for ever. Lady[r], despise not my praise: and vouchsafe to accept

[p] Ps. 10. [q] Ps. 13. [r] Ps. 16. [s] Ps. 18. [t] Ps. 19.
[u] Ps. 20. [x] Ps. 25. [y] Ps. 26. [z] Ps. 31. [a] Ps. 32.
[b] Ps. 35. [c] Ps. 40. [d] Ps. 46. [e] Ps. 51. [f] Ps. 54.
[g] Ps. 57. [h] Ps. 68. [i] Ps. 71. [k] Ps. 72. [l] Ps. 79.
[m] Ps. 89. [n] Ps. 94. [o] Ps. 95. [p] Ps. 98. [q] Ps. 107 and 118.
[r] Ps. 109.

this Psalter which is dedicated unto thee. The[s] Lord said unto our Lady, Sit thou, My mother, at My right hand. They[t] that trust in thee, O mother of God, shall not fear from the face of the enemy. Except[u] our Lady build the house of our heart, the building thereof will not continue. Blessed[x] are all they who fear our Lady, and blessed are all they who know to do thy will and thy good pleasure. Out[y] of the deep have I cried unto thee, O Lady: Lady, hear my voice. Lady[z], remember David, and all that call upon thy name. O[a] give thanks unto the Lord, because He is good: because by His most sweet Mother the Virgin Mary is His mercy given. Blessed be thou[b], O Lady, which teachest thy servants to war, and strengthenest them against the enemy. And so the last Psalm is begun with, Praise our Lady in her Saints, praise her in her virtues and miracles; and ended accordingly, with, Omnis spiritus laudet Dominam nostram; Let every spirit (or every thing that hath breath) praise our Lady."

To this we may adjoin the Psalter[c] of the salutations of the Virgin, framed by John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, which is not yet printed. His preface he beginneth thus: 'I purpose to write the praises of the Holy Virgin; who delivers us from prison through her Son, quickening our whole race by a work wondrous in efficacy:' and endeth with a prayer to the Blessed Virgin, 'that she would release the sins of all those for whom he prayed, and cause both his own name and theirs to be written in the book of life.' Then followeth his first Psalm; wherein he prayeth, that 'she would make us to meditate often God's law,' and, afterwards 'to be made blessed in the glory of God's kingdom.' His other 149 Psalms (which are fraught with the same kind of stuff) I pass over. But Bernardinus de Senis[d], his boldness may not be forgotten; who thinketh that "God will give him leave to maintain, that the Virgin Mary did more unto Him, or at least as much, as He Himself did unto all mankind, and that we may say for our comfort, (forsooth) that in respect of the blessed Virgin (whom God Himself did make notwithstanding), God after a sort is more bound unto us, than we are unto Him." With which absurd and wretched speculation, Bernardinus de Busti[e] after him was so well pleased, that he dareth to revive again this odious comparison.—"But O most grateful Virgin, didst not thou something to God. Didst not thou make Him any recompence? Truly, (if it be lawful to speak it) thou in some respect didst

[s] Ps. 110. [t] Ps. 125. [u] Ps. 127. [x] Ps. 128. [y] Ps. 130. [z] Ps. 132. [a] Ps. 136. [b] Ps. 144.

[c] Called by J. Pits, de Ill. Angl. Script. p. 380. Psalter. Medit. B. Mariæ.

[d] Serm. 61. art. 1. c. 11.

[e] Marial, p. 6. Serm. 2. memb. 3.

greater things to God, than God Himself did to thee and to all mankind. I will therefore speak that, which thou out of thy humility hast past in silence. For thou only didst sing, 'He that is mighty hath done to me great things,' but I do sing and say, that 'thou hast done greater things to Him that is mighty.'" Neither is that vision much better, which the same author[f] reciteth as shewed to St. Francis, or (as others[g] would have it) to his companion Friar Lion; touching the two ladders that reached from earth to heaven; the one red, upon which Christ leaned, from whence many fell backward and could not ascend; the other white, upon which the holy Virgin leaned: the help whereof such as used, were by her received with a cheerful countenance, and so with facility ascended into Heaven. Neither yet that sentence, which came first from Anselm[h], and was after him used by Ludolphus Saxo[i] the Carthusian, and Chrysostomus à Visitatione[k] the Cistercian Monk: that "more present relief is sometimes found by commemorating the name of Mary, than by calling upon the Name of our Lord Jesus her only Son." Which one of our Jesuits[l] is so far from being ashamed to defend, that he dareth to extend it further to the mediation of other Saints also; telling us very peremptorily, that "as our Lord Jesus worketh greater miracles by His Saints than by Himself (John xiv. 12.) so, often He sheweth the force of their intercession more than of His own."

All which I do lay down thus largely[m], not because I take any delight in rehearsing those things, which deserve rather to be

[f] Ib. p. 9. Serm. 2. assim. 2.

[g] Spec. vit. Fransisci et socior. ej. p. 2. c. 45. Spec. exempl. dist. 7. exempl. 41.

[h] de Excell. B. Virg. c. 6.

[i] de Vita Christi, p. 2. c. 60.

[k] de Verb. Dominæ, t. 2. l. 2. c. 2.

[l] H. Fitz-Simon of the Mass, l. 2. p. 2. c. 3.

[m] Melancholy as all this, it is only a specimen of what might be produced; thus Whitaker (adv. Camp. Rat. 9. p. 44.) quotes from the Prosa Missæ de Concept. "Thou art the sure hope of the miserable, truly the mother of the parentless, thou art the relief of the oppressed, the medicine of the weak, *thou art all things to all;*" and from a book of "hours" entitled the Hist. sec. chorum August. de Comm. Beatiss. Virg. Mariæ (Opp. p. 219.) framed, (which is the more shocking) on the Magnificat, which it corrects, "Rejoice, heavenly Lady, exalt and magnify God thy Saviour, Who made thee alone of thy kind; thou willedst to call thyself the 'handmaiden' of Jesus Christ, but as the Divine law teaches, thou art Mistress over Him (tu ipsius es Domina) for right and reason have it, that the mother should be set over (præesse) the son; therefore pray suppliantly and direct with authority (præcipe sublimiter) that in the eventide of the world He lead us to the kingdoms above;" and "Thou alone peerless whom the Lord chose to be mediatrix between God and man, &c." and in "the Office to her, reformed by Pius V." "Mary mother of grace, mother of mercy, do thou protect us from the enemy, and receive us at the hour of death."

buried in everlasting oblivion; but first, that the world may take notice, what kind of monster is nourished in the Papacy under that strange name of Hyperdulia: the bare discovery whereof, I am persuaded, will prevail as much with a mind that is touched with any zeal of God's honour, as all other arguments and authorities whatsoever. Secondly, that such unstable souls as look back upon Sodom and have a lust to return unto Egypt again, may be advised to look a little into this sink, and consider with themselves, whether the steam that ariseth from thence be not so noisome, that it is not to be endured by one that hath any sense left in him of piety. And thirdly, that such as be established in the present truth, may be thankful to God for this great mercy vouchsafed unto them.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the above has been in type, I have been furnished with a melancholy confirmation of the truth of Mr. Newman's words, that the "received doctrine of the Roman schools of that day" is "unhappily that of this day too;" that

> "The present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, to judge by what we see of it in public, goes very far indeed to substitute another Gospel for the true one. Instead of setting before the soul the Holy Trinity—it does seem to me as a popular system to preach the Blessed Virgin and the Saints."

It would probably be a first impression on reading these extracts from Abp. Ussher, that he had with much learning brought together a mass of objectionable language, which it might be hoped was now done away; that all these were the exaggerations of individual minds, and that it was not fair to charge them as teaching now received in the Roman Church. This was my own hope; I reprinted them in illustration of the meaning of the Article, but certainly, little thinking of imputing them to Rome at the present day. The contrary, however, of all this is sadly the case. The same extracts which Abp. Ussher adduces as illustrating the difference between "the Romish doctrine of the invocation of Saints" and ancient addresses

to them, are, in "the Glories of Mary Mother of God by Saint Alphonsus Liguori, and carefully revised by a Catholic Priest," (third ed. Dublin, 1837,) adduced as authoritative teaching. The subjects of the early chapters, which they are adduced to establish, are "how great should be our confidence in Mary, Queen of Mercy," (§. 1) "as our Mother," (§. 2.) "the great love borne us by Mary, our Mother," (§. 3.) that "Mary is *the* refuge of repentant sinners" and so (§. 4.) "our life, since she obtains us the pardon of our sins," (c 2. §. 1.) "because she obtains us perseverance," (§. 2.) "the *necessity* of Mary's intercession in order to obtain salvation," (c. 5.) &c. The sayings of Bernardine of Sienna, Albertus M., Bonaventure, &c. are alleged as authorities. It is still alleged as a true saying, "All is subject to Mary's empire, even God," (p. 138, see Abp. Ussher, above p. 196.) It is not, of course, to be supposed that no mention should be made of her SON, or from time to time that her intercession is available through her SON, or that "Jesus is our Redeemer, Mary our Advocate." (p. 88.) "Jesus is my only hope, and after Him you, O Virgin Mary" (p. 90.) One could not imagine any thing written by a Christian in entire forgetfulness of his Lord; but these are but scanty; the main object of the work is, (as it professes,) "the Glories of Mary," and these are so set forth, as for the most part to end in her, to place her where a Catholic would expect mention of his Lord. Thus at the hour of death, it is said, "May I invoke you during life, and die when calling on—Mary, my Mother, my blessed amiable Mother." (p. 38.) To whom again could it be thought that such language as the following is addressed?

"If you grant me your aid, what can I fear? during life and at my death, your name and remembrance shall be the delight of my soul. p. 74. I desire to consecrate myself more particularly to your service—dispose of me according to your good pleasure; direct me; I abandon myself wholly to your conduct; never more let me be guided by myself; chastise me, if I disobey you; your correction will be sweet and agreeable. (Ps. cxli. 5.) I am then no longer mine, *I am all yours.*" (p. 30.) "My sins render me unworthy of approaching you. I should expect nothing but chastisement from your hands.—I place in you *all my confidence,* and provided I may be happy enough to die before your image, I shall firmly hope to join in heaven that innumerable multitude who have been saved by

your intercession." (p. 53, 4.) "How dare a sinner, unworthy as I, appear before you? I am the last of sinners; I have offended the Divine Majesty more than any other; since I cannot recall the past, help me to amend the present." (p. 57.) "O consolation of the afflicted! have pity upon me; remorse of conscience gnaws me; my best actions are but imperfectly performed; hell awaits to carry off my soul; divine Justice must be satisfied; what then shall become of me? what shall be my eternal lot?" (p. 83.) "He who is protected by you cannot be lost; heaven and earth confess it. Hence though all creatures forget me, though the whole world abandon me, provided you forsake me not, I should think myself secure." (p. 90.) "I cannot abandon myself to despair; because you are my refuge, and your clemency is unbounded." (p. 135.) "All power has been given unto you in heaven and on earth; nothing is impossible to you, for you can give hope to the desponding." (p. 138.)

Again, it is, of course, presupposed and sometimes expressed that S. Mary is a mediatrix with our Lord, that her power is derived from Him, and through Him; but then, at best, it is a power absolutely vested in her; it is not the Intercession of a creature, however exalted; it is the will of one, whose will is complied with and obeyed. She stands between the soul and its Judge; it need not go to its Judge; it has but to gain the intercession of His Mother, and leave the rest to her.

"Because she opens at pleasure the abyss of the Divine mercy, no sinner, however enormous his crimes may be, can perish if he is protected by Mary." (p 25.) "Every petition she offers is as a law emanating from the Lord, by which He *obliges Himself* to be merciful to those for whom she intercedes." (p. 24.) "You have the keys of the Divine mercy, draw on this inexhaustible treasure, and dispense its riches to this poor sinner, in proportion to his immense wants." (p. 136.) "When Mary," says S. Peter Damian, "presents herself before Jesus, the altar of reconciliation, she rather seems to dictate than to supplicate, and has more the air of a Queen than a subject"—"the saint (Bernardine) wishes to insinuate that God hears Mary's prayers, as if they were commands." 'The Lord, O Mary, has so exalted you,' says S. Anselm, 'that His favour has rendered you omnipotent.' 'Yes,' says Richard of S. Laurence, 'Mary is omnipotent, for according to all laws the queen enjoys the same privileges as the king, and that power may be equal between the Son and the Mother.'" (p. 138.) "Albertus M. makes you say, 'It suffices to entreat me to desire a thing, for whatsoever I wish is neces-

sarily accomplished.'" (p. 139.) "All good comes to us with Mary; he who has found her, has found all grace, all virtue, since there is no good, which he does not obtain through her intercession. She herself warns us that she has *at her disposal all the treasures of the Divinity.* 'With me are glory and riches, that I may enrich them that love me.' Hence S. Bonaventure wishes us ever to keep our eyes on the hands of Mary, to receive from them all that is necessary for our true welfare." (comp. Ps. 123, 2.) p. 88. "Another time, our Blessed Lord said to Mary in the presence of St Gertrude, 'I know that in virtue of My Omnipotence I have invested you with power to deal out mercy in such a measure as you find good, to all sinners who invoke you.'" (p. 104, 5.) "We, holy Virgin, hope for grace and salvation from you, and since you need but say the word, ah, do so, you shall be heard, and we shall be saved." (p. 144.)

To add one more definite statement from a popular and authoritative work, the "Treatise on the Scapular," (c. 7. p. 43.)

"It is a Catholic proposition, that the most sacred Virgin Mary, by a *participated* authority, granted to her as Mother of Jesus Christ, can do much in all things, where mercy doth contend with justice. Wherefore S. Anselm saith, "There is no doubt but the Blessed Virgin Mary, by maternal right, is with Christ president of heaven and earth. S. John Damascene saith, It is fitting and convenient that Mary should possess what is her Son's.—Hence we may infer how the Blessed Virgin can free the souls of her devouts out of purgatory, and fulfil her other promises made to the brothers and sisters of the holy Confraternity; to wit, by a power communicated to her by her Son. For she being really Mother of the Word Incarnate, there is in all propriety due to her a certain power, or, as others say, a dominion over all things, as well spiritual as temporal, to which the authority of her Son doth extend itself. So that she hath by a natural right of maternity, a power almost like that of her Son, of which she may serve herself, as often as she shall think good. Relying therefore on this *her participated omnipotency*, and on the efficaciousness of her merits and intercessions, she promised the devouts of her holy habit to free them from the temporary pains of purgatory fire, from the eternal pains of hell-fire, and from many dangers and calamities of this life, as well spiritual as temporal."

Yet this has been said yet more strongly in "the Glories

of Mary," that she not only "partakes His Omnipotence," but that He has "resigned" it to her.

"Now the King of heaven, Whose bounty is infinite, desiring nothing so ardently as to confer His favours on us, in order to increase our confidence in Him, has given us His Mother for our Mother, and in her hands resigned, (if we might say so,) His omnipotence in the sphere of grace, that we might place in her the hope of our salvation, and all the help necessary to attain it." (p. 85.)

And this power they are fond of representing as belonging to her, not as the creature of whom our Lord deigned to take our nature, but (as before in Abp. Ussher, p. 195. 196. 198. 199. 202.) derived from her own merit towards her Son, as the result of a debt which He owed her. They are painfully fond of placing her in the same relation as The Father.

"Mary owes her Son an infinite gratitude for choosing her for His Mother, but it is not less true to say that Jesus Christ has contracted a species of obligation towards her for the human existence He received from her, and in recompense for this benefit, He honours her by hearing her prayers." (ib. p. 26, 7.)

"Mary has not spared her own Son, her own soul, for the salvation of many." p. 32. "If to evince the love of God the Father for man it is said, that 'He delivered up His own Son for them;' may we not use the same terms, to express the love of Mary? 'Yes,' says S. Bonaventure, 'Mary has so loved us, that she has given us her only Son.' 'She gave Him us,' says F. Nieremberg, 'when in virtue of her jurisdiction over Him as mother, she permitted Him to deliver Himself up to the Jews.' 'She gave Him for us—she hath given this Well-Beloved Son; she sacrificed for us a Son, Who was infinitely dearer to her than herself.' 'If *our* salvation was then so near her heart.' (p. 41—43.) 'This Divine Saviour Whom she has given to the world.' (p. 131.) 'Richard of S. Laurence beautifully explains this passage, (Prov. xxx. 11.) in reference to the holy Virgin, 'The heart of the man of God who trusts in Mary, he shall not want spoils,' for she has snatched from hell its prey, to enrich with spoils our Lord Jesus Christ."

"In taking flesh in your chaste womb, a God has been pleased to become your debtor, in order to place afterwards at your disposal all the treasures of His unbounded mercy," (p. 144.) "as it was revealed to S. Bridget, Jesus has obliged Himself to grant all the desires and requests of His blessed Mother, not willing to

refuse her any thing in heaven, since she has refused Him nothing on earth." (p. 138, 9.)

"S. Germanus says to Mary, 'You, O holy Virgin, have over God the authority of a Mother, and hence you obtain pardon for the most obdurate sinners.'"

So that at last it seems nothing strange, that she should be introduced as upbraiding an apostate, "Thou hast renounced *me* and my Son," (p. 135.) or that she should be addressed by a penitent, "I have by my impurity sinned against God and against *thee*," (p. 80.) or with the attribute of Divinity, "O sweet in *communicating*[a] thyself to those that love you, to those that seek you." (p. 193.)

It is, of course, believed in the abstract, that our Lord is the One Mediator with the Father, and the blessed Virgin a mediatrix only with our Lord; Rome is not charged with denying, but with overlaying the Faith by her additions; but practically, at the best, where is the inducement held out to a sinner to go further than the blessed Virgin, when it is taught that she has all power given her, that she obtains what she wills, that persons need only pray to her? Certainly it is said that none can be saved who do not pray to her, but it is not taught (but the contrary) that those will not be saved who pray to none besides her, who never pray to God. Nor can this be paralleled with the Catholic doctrine of prayer to the Father through the Son; undoubtedly, there may be a form of unconscious Unitarianism lurking under exclusive prayer to our Lord; (as it would also be un-Scriptural and un-Catholic;) but, at least, in such prayers, prayer is offered to Him Who with the Father and the Holy Ghost is One God; in these prayers to the Virgin, the creature is substituted for the Creator as the object of prayer.

Such, it is much to be feared, must be the effect of this teaching on common minds; but, at the very best, her office, as thus set forth, practically takes the place of that which our Blessed Lord deigns to bear. The feelings of

[a] It seems but a following out of this teaching that a heresy is said to exist among the lower ranks in Rome, that in the Holy Eucharist, not only our Lord but His Mother is present. Such a heresy would, again, naturally follow from such teaching as, "Mary and Jesus having but one and the same Flesh, says S. Arnand Abbot, why should not the Mother enjoy, conjointly with the Son, the honours of royalty?" The application to the Holy Eucharist seems to lie nearer, and were not more profane, than that actually made.

devout affection, trust, and hope amid our sins, "boldness in approaching to the throne of grace," consciousness that we have One Who can have a feeling for our infirmities, which, in the Catholic system, are directed towards our Lord, as being man although God, in the Romanist are turned aside to His Mother. Our Lord is contemplated as God and our Judge, the blessed Virgin has that office which, in the Catholic system, is occupied by the glorified Humanity of our Lord; justice and mercy are no longer met together, but justice is apportioned to our Lord, His other attribute of mercy is divided from Him and given to His Mother. The soul is invited, not to lift itself up to Him, but to rest in His Mother, as finding in her the very attributes, which Holy Scripture and the Catholic Church set forth to us in our Lord.

Some painful evidence of this has been already given by Abp. Ussher; these statements are repeated, and enforced to this day:

"Mary is Queen of mercy alone; she is a sovereign, not to punish sinners but to pardon and forgive them.—Gerson observes that as the kingdom of God consists in mercy and justice, the Lord has, as it were, divided it; reserving to Himself the dominion of justice, and yielding to His Mother that of mercy. S. Thomas confirms this, when he says, that one half of the kingdom of God was given to Mary, when she conceived and brought forth the Eternal Word, so that she became Queen of mercy as her Son is King of justice. A learned interpreter, writing on Ps. lxxii. 1. says to God, 'Lord, you have given justice to the King your Son, because you have reserved mercy for the Queen His Mother.' S. Bonaventure and Ernest Abp of Prague, explain the words in nearly the same terms," (p. 23;) "Let us go then, Christians, let us go to this most gracious Queen, and crowd around her throne, (comp. Heb. iv. 16.) without being deterred by our crimes and abominations. Let us be convinced that Mary has been crowned Queen of mercy, it is that the greatest sinners may be saved by her intercession [b]." (p. 27, 28.) "Prayer in the mouth of a sinner—is useful and salutary, S. Thomas says, being founded not on the merits of him who prays, but on the goodness of God and the merits of Jesus Christ.—It is just the same with our petitions made in the name of His most holy Mother. If he who prays merits not to be heard, the merits of Mary will pray for him, says S. Anselm, exhorting all sinners to address themselves

[b] The shocking vision of the "two ladders," (see above, in Abp. Ussher, p. 203.) is repeated, p. 180.

confidently to—the Mother of God." (p. 51.) "S. Bernardine of Sienna asserts, that 'if God has not destroyed man after his sin, it was in consideration of—the blessed Virgin! and out of the singular love He bore her; he even doubts not that all the mercies granted to sinners in the old law have been given in consideration of—Mary! With good reason then does S. Bernard exhort us to seek grace through her since she has found the grace which we have lost. It is [not for herself, 'who needed it not, being by her' (immaculate) 'conception full of grace;'"] 'it is for sinners,' says Cardinal Hugo, 'that Mary has found grace, which they had irretrievably lost. Hence let them come, and say to her with confidence, render us what belongs to us." (p. 59.) "I shall no longer apprehend either my sins, since you can repair them; or the devils, since you are more powerful than hell; or your Son justly irritated, since one word from you will appease Him. I shall only fear myself, and that forgetting to invoke you, I shall be lost." (p. 74.) "If my Saviour drive me off because of my sins, I shall go and cast myself at the feet of His Mother; thence I shall not rise, until she has obtained my pardon; for she does not know what it is to be insensible to the voice of misery, and her pity will soften the anger of her Son. Regard us then, O Mary most merciful, for we your servants place all our hope in you." (p. 89.) "'The sun,' says Hugo, 'is a figure of Jesus Christ, whose splendid rays illumine the just who live in the day of grace; the moon is typical of Mary, whose mild lustre illumines sinners amid the dreary night of sin.' 'It is towards this propitious orb,' says Innocent III., 'that he who is buried in the shades of iniquity should look.' Having lost divine grace, the day disappears, there is *no more sun for him;* but the moon is still on the horizon; let him address himself to Mary." (p. 91.) "'This strong hold,' says Albertus M., 'is the sacred Virgin established in grace and glory.' Once introduced to her let us be silent, for it does not become us to open our mouth before the Lord, Whom we have so much offended, but leave Mary to speak and intercede for us." (p. 92.) "The glorious S. Bonaventure, to animate our confidence in Mary, represents to us a raging sea, in which sinners, already fallen from the vessel of divine grace, are tossed about by the billows of temptation, torn by the gnawings of remorse, and horrified by the terrors of Divine Justice, without light or guide, are ready to be swallowed up in the gulf of despair; but just then the Lord shews them Mary the star of the sea, and seems to say to them, 'Sinners, unfortunate sinners, despair not, fix your eyes on this bright luminary; its lustre will save you from the tempest, and conduct you to the port of salvation.' Blosius figures Mary to us, as the *only* refuge of those who have incurred the Divine indignation." (p. 93.) "The prophet

complained—'Lord, we have sinned, and there is none to restrain your arm from falling heavy upon us;' but now Mary presents herself between God and His offending creatures.—Richard of S. Laurence also observes on this subject, that in the old law, God often complained that there was none to interpose between Him and sinners, but since Mary, the mediatrix of peace, has appeared on earth, she restrains His arm and averts His wrath." (p. 94.) "S Anselm, in order to increase our confidence in Mary, assures us that our prayers will often be more speedily heard in invoking her name than in calling on that of Jesus Christ, and the reason he gives is, that Jesus being no less our Judge than our Saviour, He must avenge the wrongs we do Him by our sins, while the holy Virgin being solely our advocate, is obliged to entertain only sentiments of pity for us."

This is thus reconciled with the belief, which of course, Romanists must hold, that there is but "One Mediator between God and man."

"We are far from insinuating, *nevertheless*, that she is *more* powerful than her Son. Jesus Christ is our only Mediator; He alone has obtained our reconciliation with God His Father; but as in recurring to Him, Whom we must necessarily consider a Judge Who will punish the ungrateful, it is probable a sentiment of fear may lessen the confidence necessary for being heard, it would seem that in applying to Mary, whose office is that of mercy, our hope would be so strong as to obtain all we ask for." (p. 103.)

The explanation, however, leaves the fact as it was, that St. Mary is set forth as a more desirable Advocate than our Lord.

"How is it, that whereas we ask many things of God without obtaining them, we no sooner ask through Mary than they are granted us?" ib.

"As we have not access to The Father but by Jesus Christ, we have not access to Jesus Christ but through Mary, that this Divine Saviour Whom she has given to the world, may receive us from her hands. Who could know God except by you, O holy Virgin? who could be saved, O powerful Virgin, except through your intercession?" (p. 131.) Hugh of S. Victor exhorts us, if we are deterred by apprehension of the Divine Majesty, to approach to Mary without fear. She is, it is true, holy and spotless, the Queen of the Universe and the Mother of God, but she is also a pure creature, and a child of Adam like unto us. "If

you fear to approach to God, look to Mary; then thou findest nothing to fear; thou seest thy own race." (p. 191.)

And these recommendations are enforced by the history of great sinners who were saved, having sought mercy of Mary alone.

"In my last moments, abandoned by all, and seeing myself loaded with sins, I addressed this prayer to the Mother of God, 'O thou, the refuge of the forsaken, have pity on me! Hope of the universe, my only hope, come to my assistance.' This little supplication was not made in vain. Mary obtained for me the grace of true contrition, by means of which I escaped Hell." (p. 40. see also p. 54—57.) "'I promised my Mother most readily (to recite the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin every day), and never failed to keep my word amid all my debaucheries; nay, I confess that for the last ten years it is the only act of religion I ever performed,' the confessor now saw clearly, that the conversion of this young man was owing to the special protection of Mary," (p. 90.)

These intercessions of S. Mary are represented also,

"As not only useful but necessary to this great end (our salvation), not of an absolute necessity, it is true, but of a moral necessity, which has its source in the Divine will." (p. 116.)

"Poor souls, what are you thinking of when you abandon Mary, when you cease crying to her for protection? 'Take away the sun,' says S. Bernard, 'and what does the world become? An abode of horror, a chaos of confusion; thus, let a soul abandon Mary, and she is seated in darkness, that darkness which the Holy Spirit says, 'favours the passage of the beasts of the forest.' 'Woe to him,' says S. Anselm, 'who despises the light of this sun, that is, who neglects Mary; it is soon night with him, and his soul becomes a haunt of sin and of devils.' S. Francis Borgia doubted, and with reason, of the perseverance of such as had not a special devotion to Mary. Enquiring one day of the novices, to which saint each one was most devoted, he perceived, that some among them were wanting in devotion to the blessed Virgin, whereupon he noticed the master of novices, and desired him to have a particular watch on these young people. The event justified the saint's fears; all those who had not honoured Mary, lost the grace of their vocation and quitted the society. S. Germanus then had reason to call Mary, 'the respiration of Christians;' for as the body cannot exist without breathing, so the soul cannot live without recurring to the Mother of God." (p. 67.)

"'Blessed Virgin,' says S. Anselm, 'as it is impossible, that he who neglects and despises you, can be saved, so it is impossible, that he who has recourse to you sincerely, can be lost.' S. Antonius says, 'As those from whom Mary turns her merciful eyes, cannot be saved, it necessarily follows, that those on whom she looks with benignity, will share in eternal glory.' And here let us ask, if the words, 'It is impossible that he who is devout to Mary,' should not make those tremble, who despise or neglect her? Let all such hear the anathema pronounced against them by Albertus Magnus; 'The people who will not serve you shall perish.' And S. Bonaventure, 'He who neglects Mary, shall die in his sins—he who does not invoke her, shall have no share in the kingdom of God;' and again, 'There is no hope of salvation for those from whom Mary turns her face.'—"On the contrary, Mary assures us, that 'He who hears her, shall not be confounded.' S. Bonaventure says, 'Great Queen! he who perseveres in your service, is far from damnation.' 'No,' adds S. Hilary, 'he will not be lost, although he might have hitherto grievously offended his God." p. 167.

And thus not only is S. Mary held out to returning sinners as a Mediatrix more suited to them than our Lord, but as *the* special means, whereby they who stand may be kept upright.

"We have the same hope as this great saint, and shall not cease to say with S. Bonaventure, 'O Mary, I have hoped in you, and shall never be confounded." (p. 172.) S. Philip Neri used to say, 'My children, if you wish to persevere, be devout to Mary.' The venerable Berchman, S. J. said also, 'That he who loves Mary, will persevere to the end.' And Abbot Rupert draws from the parable of the prodigal a very ingenious reflection to the same effect. 'If this libertine child,' said he, 'had his Mother, he would never have abandoned his paternal home, or he would have returned sooner:' thus he who has Mary for Mother, never abandons God, or if he does, he soon seeks Him again. Oh if all men loved this most merciful Mother, and had recourse to her in the hour of temptation, we would seldom see any one lost, or suffer shipwreck.' We fall, and we are lost, when we fail to invoke her assistance. Saint Laurence Justinian applies to the blessed Virgin these words of Ecclesiasticus, 'I walked on the waves of the sea;' for he makes her say, 'I walk on the waves of the sea with my servants, in order to save them from a melancholy shipwreck.' S. Thomas Villanova says, 'When the birds of prey (meaning the devils) pounce on us, let us imitate the chickens, who when the hawk appears, fly for refuge under the wings of their Mother; let us

fly to Mary without losing a moment, and she will secure us in her maternal bosom. O Mary, continues the saint, addressing the Queen of heaven; it is for you to defend us, since you after God are our refuge, our protectress, our sweetest hope.' We shall conclude with the words of S. Bernard: 'Christian whoever thou art, thy life on earth is a perilous navigation: if thou dost not wish to be drowned, turn not away thy eyes from this brilliant star, look up at the star of mariners, invoke Mary in occasions of sin, in the struggle of temptation, in the midst of danger call Mary to thy aid; let her powerful name be ever in thy heart, and on thy lips, to inspire thee with confidence; trust in Mary, and thou wilt not fall into despair; follow her, and thou wilt not stray; let her hand protect thee, and thou wilt have nothing to fear; let her be thy guide, and thou wilt infallibly arrive at the haven of salvation. This do, and thou shalt live." (p. 69—71.) "The Church in her public service teaches us to recur to Mary under the titles of Health of the sick; Refuge of sinners; Help of Christians. In her offices for the festivals of Mary, she applies to her these words of Wisdom: 'In me is all hope of life and virtue;' again, 'he who finds me shall find life, and obtain salvation from the Lord: they who work in me shall have life everlasting.' Now what do all those texts go to prove, but that the intercession of Mary is necessary for us?"

Lastly, it should be noticed that there is an essential difference between the way in which men's salvation is in any passages of the fathers said to be derived through S. Mary, and that in which it is attributed to her by these later writers. The object of S. Irenæus[c] and other fathers, in the first place, is not to magnify S. Mary, but to point out the reality of the Incarnation, which was denied by the Gnostic heretics; but then, further, the benefits are said to be derived through her, in that, of her according to the flesh, Christ was born; in the later writers, they are attributed to her by virtue of the dignity, *since* bestowed upon her: in the fathers, they are spoken as coming from her indirectly, in later writers, directly; in the fathers, from her when on earth, in later writers from her in Heaven; in the fathers from the Nativity of our Lord, later, from *her* sovereignty, rule, Intercession, Command,

c "This comparison between Mary and Eve ('that the world is freed by [through] a Virgin, which before by a virgin [Eve] had fallen under sin,') in the same manner as Christ and Adam are compared, is so common among the older writers, that from S. Irenæus downwards, it would be easy to fill pages with quotations." Dr. Wiseman's remarks on Mr. Palmer's Letter, p. 24.

with which for her merits she is alleged to be invested. The expressions of the fathers do not go beyond St. Paul's words, "Adam was not deceived, but, the woman being deceived was in the transgression; notwithstanding, she shall be saved through the childbearing," as though the blessed fact that our Lord was "born of a woman" had some mysterious relation to the fall by a woman; that there is a correspondence between death coming through the transgression of the woman and life coming through her. In the "Glories of Mary" it is expressly denied that this is the sense in which the modern sayings should be taken.

"That God has constituted Mary the ordinary dispensatrix of His graces, was the opinion of St. Bernard: it is now the common opinion of all theologians, and all doctors. It is taught by Tega, Mendozza, Poire, Pacciuchelli, Segneri, Crasset, and a crowd of others. Even Father Noel Alexander, so reserved in his propositions, says, 'That God wishes that all the favours men expect from Him, they should be indebted for to the intercession of Mary.'"

"But this doctrine does not please a certain modern author: this person, who otherwise speaks with much piety and learning, of true and false devotion, is very parsimonious when there is question of the worship of the holy Virgin, refusing her that glory, and those privileges, which a St. Germanus, a St. Anselm, a St. John Damascene, St. Bonaventure, a St. Antonius, a St. Bernardine of Sienna, and innumerable other holy doctors, made no difficulty to grant her. He pretends that the aforesaid proposition, 'God confers no grace but through Mary's intercession,' is an hyperbole which fervour caused some saints to utter, and that it is only correct in this sense, that 'Mary has given to the world, Jesus the Author of grace;' for, adds he, 'the apostle formally teaches, that we acknowledge but One sole Mediator between God and man, viz. the Word made flesh." (p. 116, 7.)

It is for earnest-minded Romanists seriously to consider the tendency of all this; Faith is not holding truth in the abstract, it must penetrate the life and run through a man's whole belief; worldly-minded persons are often, in the whole habit of their mind, Socinians, although if asked they would acknowledge or think that they believed the Divinity and Atonement of our Lord; and persons may be practically worshippers of the Blessed Virgin only, while they would acknowledge in the abstract that she derives all her power from her Son. It ought probably to awaken

some fears in them that they habitually contemplate and speak of S. Mary as "the Mother of God" only, still speak of our Lord, in reference to her, as her Son only; there may be in this a subtle Humanitarianism, which, while they are encouraged to shrink from the thought of their Lord as their Judge, thinks of Him only as the Son of Mary, and while it acknowledges S. Mary as the Mother of God, practically forgets that He created her, and in that they hold her to have been without sin, denies that He redeemed her. The term "Mother of God" expresses Catholic truth; yet may it be, and it is, continually used by Romanists in an heretical sense.

While these things are so, although we did not separate from Rome, yet since God has permitted that Rome should separate us from her, we see not how the Anglican Church could re-unite with her, without betraying the trust which she owes to her own children.

THE END.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

4

To: R: Shirley

ARE THE PUSEYITES SINCERE?

A

LETTER

MOST RESPECTFULLY ADDRESSED TO

A RIGHT REVEREND

CATHOLIC LORD BISHOP,

ON

The Oxford Movement.

BY THE REVEREND JOSEPH RATHBORNE.

" Creditis avectos hortes ? aut ulla putatis
Dona carere dolis Danaum ? Sic notus Ulixes ?
Aut hæc in nostros fabricata est machina muros,
Aut aliquis latet error."

VIRGIL.

LONDON:
T. JONES, 63, PATERNOSTER ROW;
W. STONE, BIRMINGHAM.

1841.

Printed by T. Jones, 63, Paternoster Row, London.

A LETTER,

&c. &c.

My dear Lord Bishop,

Several reasons have convinced me of the propriety and the expediency of addressing your Lordship in language of great respect, and through your Lordship, the Catholic public in a style of great candour and openness, upon the interesting and all engrossing subject, the movement at Oxford. The kindness and affectionate regard I have always met from your Lordship, will, I trust, interest you upon a subject upon which I feel so anxious that we shall all form a correct opinion, and, if possible, become all of one mind, and neither be warped with undue prejudices, or be carried away by visionary hopes which can never be realised. Your profound theological knowledge, your great talents, and your noble virtues, have fitted you to be a wise and righteous judge in Israel, while your prudence and caution ever protect you from coming to any hasty decision.

Would, my Lord, that in the Oxford movement, I could hail a struggle of great and noble minds with ancient prejudices and grounded prepossessions; would that I could congratulate our holy Church on Dr. Pusey and his party desiring a re-union with the only centre of Catholic commu-

nion; would that in the deluding glimmering of Catholic truth, called Puseyism, which shines over some of the worst of Protestant corruption, I could behold a pillar of God's light, directing the stiff-necked generation that now dwells upon the banks of the Isis, through the waters of their religious desolation, to the happy land of Catholic sincerity and feeling. But that this Oxford crisis is a real progress to Catholicism, I have all along considered a most perfect delusion. I look upon Mr. Newman, Dr. Pusey, and their associates, as wily and crafty, though unskilful guides. If they have brought upon themselves an unexpected check in their wild career, it was not because they were too eager in their advances towards Rome, but they were too anxious to mar the triumphs of Catholicism. It was because they were too reckless of the means which they have ungenerously employed, in order to prevent our numbers being increased by the accession of many great and good men, who, tired of the Church of England as it is, had almost fully determined to join the ancient religion of our forefathers. "The Protestant confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics," says the Tract ninety, and by the thirty-nine articles as there explained, "Catholics will not be excluded." In other words, do not quit the Church of England; for as we have interpreted the creed of Anglicanism, you may change your belief without going over to the Church of Rome.

My Lord, I am fully convinced, from a diligent perusal of many of their writings, that Dr. Pusey and his party have anything but a desire of being convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion; and what is more, I believe that they anxiously and earnestly impugn what they ought to know is the only faith of primitive Christianity. In order, however, to arrive at a safe knowledge of the motives that

have guided, of the spirit which has directed them, we must not trust to our hopes or desires for informaiton. We must make their published sermons and treaties our only unerring instructors. Now I am deeply anxious to place before your Lordship the character of the writings of these gentlemen. I am the more so, as I find they are obtaining a character which they ill deserve. I have myself been obliged to give the most serious cautions to some of my own acquaintance, who, on account of the praises which have been lavished upon these men by some of our own body, have unwittingly recommended the writings of the Puseyites to their Protestant friends, almost already convinced of the truth of our religion, as admirable works, fitted to accomplish the great deed of conversion. Yes, some of our Catholic brethren have been led to suppose that the works of Dr. Pusey are little less orthodox than those of Bishop Milner; the writings of Mr. Newman than those of our accomplished Dr. Fletcher; the books of Mr. Palmer than the admirable publications of our great and eminent Dr. Wiseman. This, certainly, is a state of things which I think your Lordship will deeply regret, and even entirely discountenance.

I will now, with your Lordship's permission, proceed to examine whether the religious system of the Oxford Puseyites, which I consider a perfect imposition upon the credulity of the nation, can *possibly* have had its origin in a love cherished by its framers for Catholic truth. The motive which directed Mr. Newman to write that celebrated Tract, No. 90, which has excited such an extraordinary feeling throughout Great Britain, we may best discover in Mr. Newman's own words, in a letter addressed to Dr. Jelf. "I may be sorry (he says) in my conviction, I may be wrong in the mode I adopt to meet it, but the Tract is grounded

on the belief that the articles need not be so closed as the received method of teaching closes them, and ought not, for the sake of many persons. If we close them, we run the risk of subjecting persons whom we should like least to lose or distress, to the temptation of joining the Church of Rome, or to the necessity of withdrawing from the Church as established; or to the misery of subscribing with doubt or hesitation. And, as to myself, I was led especially to exert myself with reference to this difficulty, from having had it earnestly urged upon me by parties I revere, *to do all I could to keep members of our Church from straggling in the direction of Rome;* and not being able to pursue the methods commonly adopted, and being persuaded that the view of the articles I have taken is true and honest, I was anxious to set it before them." Pages 26, 27. Now, my Lord, I cannot view it in the above passage, a manifestation of regard, but an avowal of hostility to our holy religion. I not only behold hostility, but even something very much like treachery. The embrace of Mr. Newman is the kiss that would betray us. Seeing, he tells the public, that many admirable, exemplary, and distinguished members of the Church of England, were upon the point of abandoning its communion, and of returning to the bosom of the Holy Church of our forefathers; that they could not and would not sign the thirty-nine articles, if bound to accept them as they are received by the Bishops and authorities of the Anglican religion. Seeing them already Catholics in their hearts, Mr. Newman endeavoured to fritter away the obvious and the accepted signification of the tenets of his belief; he shows that it only requires a little artfulness to give them a very different interpretation; and thus making some dogmas of faith open questions, the thirty-nine articles became a kind of interim which all parties, Catholics and

Protesants, may readily accede to. Thus is worked out the principle of Dr. Pusey, of "furnishing a resting place from Romanism to some who were wandering thither," and of providing a means for "recovering others from Romanism to the English branch of the Church."—*Letter to Dr. Bagot*, page 238.

Now, for my own part, my Lord, whatever may be Mr. Newman's opinion of truth and honesty, I look upon such conduct as singularly unfair and improper. I consider it opposed to every high feeling of moral principle; as apt to introduce sceptism and religious indifference among his own people, and if sanctioned by us, calculated to make many of the weak among our Catholic brethren too readily conclude, that there is very little difference between the doctrines of the thirty-nine articles, and the sacred dogmas of the holy council of Trent. I view in all this an artful effort to bring about that fatal occasional conformity, practised in ignorance by some weak brethren in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; a practice, my Lord, singularly commended by these men, as one which would have brought round the whole Catholic body eventually to the Church of England, had it not been stopt by the zealous exertions "of the emissiaries of Rome."

> "Accipe nunc Danaum insidias, et crimine ab uno
> Disce omnes."

And, my Lord, that we have no reason to suppose that Mr. Newman desired to do good service to Rome in writing the 90th Tract, we may discover from the postscript of his letter to Dr. Jelf, in which he says: "Those who are immediately about me know that in the interval between the printing and publication of that Tract, I was engaged in

writing some letters about Romanism, in which I spoke of the *impossibility* of any approach of the English towards the Roman Church, arising out of the present state of the latter, as strongly as I did a year ago, or as I do now in my Letter."

Numberless other proofs I may give your Lordship of the real objects cherished by this strange confraternity in the formation of their system. If Dr. Pusey write to the Bishop of Oxford in favour of church authority, he tells his Lordship that this effort to revive the drooping power of the High Church and Conservative party, is not " to approximate to Romanism, but rather to take the strongest and most unassailable point against it." (page 35.) If he speak on justification, he tells his admirers that his doctrine is "just the reverse of the Romanist." (page 75.) If he blunder upon the sacraments, still the professor holds the original truth, " of which the corruptions of Rome is a debasement." (page 144.) If he exalt the necessity of an apostolical succession, it is because " it is a protection against Rome." He talks of " Roman rags," of our Church being a kind of Antichrist, and on all occasions " Rome brings in her modern corruptions." But when Mr. Palmer writes his large and learned, though singularly unfair and misrepresenting Treatise on the Church, is he not desirous to show theological students how easily and safely they may join the holy Catholic communion? Just the contrary. He is encouraged in his labour of love by the excellence of his motive, which he avows in his preface, is to show that Rome may be assailed more effectively by the arguments of his party, than by those of the Ultra-Protestant or the Evangelical Theologian. And in his work, he has the audacity to attack us in a manner almost unthought of by our most malignant foes. Many are the pages he devotes

of his second volume, to prove that you, my Lord, and all your brother Vicars Apostolic in England, are in all probability unconsecrated laymen; that at best you are all dissenting schismatics; and that the Bishops of Anglicanism, and they only, can possibly possess spiritual authority in England. How truly Catholic must be the feelings of such gentlemen as these; how valuable must be their willing services in the great work of the reconversion of our beloved country; how sincere must be their hearts and affections in their yearnings towards our holy religion, I leave your Lordship to form your own opinion.

Having now briefly canvassed the motives of the men of the Oxford Convention, allow me to examine whether the language which they employ when speaking of our Church, when writing regarding our conduct, when treating on our demeanour as citizens and the subjects of the best of sovereigns, entitlesthem to a courtesy which Bellarmine, St. Bernard, and many of our most holy, meek, and amiable writers, indignantly refused to concede to such bitter foes of Catholicity, as loaded it with the most hateful calumny, and covered it with the grossest vituperation. We will examine whether these gentlemen of Oxford treat us any better, and not rather very much worse, than many avowed and open enemies, who wear no mask, and avow their Protestantism. Let us see if we cannot everywhere in their writings, trace a virulent hostility against the Spouse of our Blessed Saviour, which I really can compare to nothing but to that implacable enmity manifested by the Pharisees towards our Lord and Master, which drew from the meekest among the sons of men, a strong denunciation of their hypocrisy, of their cruel and unfounded calumnies. Now, my Lord, there is a celebrated passage often quoted from the 20th Tract

for the Times, which, being given without the next following sentences, has led many to believe that the party of Dr. Pusey cherish a very animated and lively affection for the Holy City. I mean the oft-cited quotation: "Truly when one surveys the grandeur of their system, a sigh arises in the thoughtful mind to think that we should be separate from them—cum talis sis, utinam noster esses." Here, my Lord, appears a sweetening cup; but now come and view the poisoned goblet. The words immediately succeeding destroy the golden vision in which the preceding sentence enraptured us. If these men anoint us with oil, it is only that we may bear their deadly blows. "But alas!" the Tract continues, "*an union is impossible.* Their communion is infected with heterodoxy; we are bound to flee them as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth; and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed—it cannot be reformed." Catholicism must be annihilated, is therefore the true creed of these pious men; the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church is an eternal bolt against that Reformation which would open our gates to Dr. Pusey; Rome must be levelled and ploughed over, or Anglicanism will never acknowledge us as the true faithful.

The Rev. Mr. Newman, the object of so much inconsiderate praise, is kind enough in his endeavours to prevent Catholicity from increasing her numbers, to represent our dear and divine religion as trying to allure admirers, by the ostensible sweetness of her preachings and the beauty of her rites; and then, when once within her embrace, triumphing over them in cruelty, torturing them in dungeons, where they must slave in darkness, and eat for

ever the bread of sorrow. "We must talk and deal with things," says Mr. Newman, "as they are, and not as they pretend to be. If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome, and make advances towards her, as if a sister or a mother church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relation, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within her reach. No; dismissing the dreams which the romance of church history, and the high doctrines of Catholicism, will raise in the inexperienced mind, let us be sure she is our enemy, and will do us mischief if she can." On Romanism, page 102, and in his letter to Dr. Jelf, page 8, Mr. Newman represents "the active and energetic principle" of our sacred Church, as manifesting itself "in ambition, insincerity, craft, cruelty, and all such grave evils as are connected with it."

My Lord, when men employ habitually such language as this, is it possible that our own members should run away with the idea that they are either our friends, or even generous and high minded opponents, because sometimes they dole out to us an empty compliment, after trying to take from us all that is valuable, and depreciating all we hold sacred? Thus, even the most eloquent of the party, the lay Puseyite, Mr. Gladstone, will grant to us, in page 143, that there have been "holy men in Romanism," and that those holy men have been "great lights of christianity"; but he thinks nothing of turning round and telling us, that we "wrongfully interpose a crowd of mediators between man and the one Mediator" (page 137);—that our doctrine of purgatory "leads to a carelessness about inward religion" (page 138);—that the doctrine of relics has a similar tendency;—that we cling to an "Italian Priest";—that "indulgences are an excuse for frailnesses" (page 140);—

that by our practice of confession "the Roman arts have infused a poison" (page 141);—that we make it "a debtor and creditor account, on which we may *run up a score,* in the intention of paying it off by penance." Indeed, my Lord, how any one after reading my reply to Mr. Gladstone's Book on the Church, in which I have given a full explanation, and I hope a refutation, of the Puseyite system, as shown forth in the writings of Gladstone, Pusey, Palmer, &c., can think these men any thing but by far our most dangerous, as well as our most artful foes, requiring arguments to meet them which many of our own people have never probably even dreamt of; I am sure is far beyond my comprehension.

But what is the most striking feature in the rancorous malignity of these men—their calumnies are often lavished upon us, when we should be led to think that the subject matter of their treatises closed every avenue against their vituperation. Thus, when Dr. Pusey takes up his pen to treat upon the holy and interesting subject of our baptism, we naturally suppose that here at least we have met with matter which forbids any cause of difference between us. We reasonably trust that in the laver of regeneration the Doctor will sink all our differences on dogma and practice. We do not expect to find, that the original sin of Puseyism, which is hostility to our holy Catholicism, will manifest itself in a treatise devoted to an explanation of the cancelling of the first handwriting which stands registered against every child of Adam. Not at all. "Rome, once characterized for steady practical adherence to sound doctrine, is a seat of Antichrist" (page 201); "The error of transubstantiation has modified other true doctrine, so as to cast into the shade the one oblation once offered on the cross;" and "Rome leads her members into error and countenances

corruption in them, when their statements themselves are not very unsound; teaching us how much evil, what seems a little departure from the truth may create." (page 192.)

Far more, however, than any of the avowed works of either Dr. Pusey, Mr. Palmer, or Mr. Newman, the Tracts for the Times, but particularly the three last volumes, have opened my eyes to the craftiness and the cunning, as well as the malice, of the members of the Oxford Convention. The perusal of these books has guarded me against what I must call a very great, and God grant it be not, a fatal delusion; as I discovered in these works, that the resuscitation of the old and hostile High Church party in the Church of England, well charged with hatred and treacherous feelings towards Rome, was the real object of Pusey and his accomplices in their Oxford hubbub. And this being the case, if once they be entirely successful; if once they obtain for their party ascendancy and power, depend upon it, my Lord, their every nerve will be strained, their every political engine will be put into motion, to grind Catholicism to dust; to crush our Religion in England, to trample upon it, and the rights of its people, in our dear sister country, Ireland. You will then know what was the object of the infamous Articles in the Quarterly Review upon Romanism and Romish Priests in Ireland, the productions of one of the Sect, the dear friend of Dr. Pusey; you will then see why a solemn compact has been entered into by these men to leave no stone unturned, until they can once more plant their ten extinguished Bishoprics upon the necks of the Irish people; (Tracts, No. 1.) you will then discover why Church authority and Tory principles are preached at the same time and from the same pulpits, while Romanists are decried as the friends of Liberal measures, and the tools of the Great Agitator.

But why invite your Lordship to waste any of your precious time in a perusal of the volumes of the Tracts for the Times? In Tract 38, I consider the writer sufficiently demonstrates how affectionate are their longings for the triumph of Rome, and conviction of the real gist of their motives must instantly break upon the mind that reflects upon the statements there so dogmatically propounded. "Be assured of this, (write these Tractarians), no party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and makes a noise, than the *Roman party*. This has been proved before now. In the *seventeenth century*, the theology of the divines of the English Church was *substantially the same as ours is;* and it experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. *It is the true Via Media.* Rome sought to block up that way as fiercely as the Puritans. History tells us this. In a few words, then, before we separate, I will state some of the irreconcileable differences with Rome as she is; and in stating her errors, I will closely follow the order observed by Bishop Hall in his treatise on *The Old Religion*, whose Protestantism is unquestionable.—I consider it unscriptural to say with the Church of Rome, that 'we are justified by inherent righteousness.'—That it is unscriptural that 'the good works of man *truly* merit eternal life.'—That the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as not being revealed, but a theory of man's devising, *is profane and impious.*—That the denial of the cup to the laity, is a bold and unwarranted encroachment on their privileges as Christ's people.—That the *sacrifice of masses as it has been practised in the Roman Church*, is without foundation in scripture or antiquity, and therefore *blasphemous and dangerous.*—That the honour paid to images is full of peril, in the case of the uneducated, that is, of the greater part of christians.—That indulgences, as in use, are a *gross* and *monstrous* invention of later

times.—That the received doctrine of Purgatory is at variance with Scripture, cruel to the better sort of Christians, and administering deceitful comfort to the irreligious.—That the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue is *a great corruption*.—That forced Confession is an unauthorised and dangerous practice.—That the *direct invocation of Saints* is a dangerous practice, as tending to give, often giving, to creatures the honour and reliance due to the Creator alone.—That the Roman doctrine of Tradition is unscriptural.—That the *claim of the Pope* to be the universal Bishop is *against Scripture and Antiquity*.—I might add other points in which also I protest against the Church of Rome, but I think it enough to make my confession in Hall's order, and so leave it."—Tract 38.

But, my Lord, after reading in the pages of Ecclesiastical history, of the endless labours and difficulties of Apostolical Popes, labours so often totally abortive, never more than very partially successful, and never of lasting efficacy, in endeavouring to cement a reunion of the Greek schismatical Church with the holy Catholic religion; and that too, where religious differences are so small; for us to look forward to a speedy re-union of the Church of England with us, with the above power of obstacles repelling all advances to each other, appears to me a most singular delusion. The Lord I know is a God of wonders; but such a miracle as this we have no experience to lead us to anticipate. If our hope ought to be a great, ought it not also to be a reasonable expectation? I do not despair of the re-conversion of England, but then I do not think it can be accomplished by such means as some of our own body too ardently anticipate. If the Puseyites are to be the new Apostles of Great Britain, my hopes for my country are lowering and gloomy.

Oh why not labour for England with the fortitude, but with the prudence also, of the best of our Saintly predecessors in the holy ministry? Why see in every wind of doctrine the breath of the Spirit which is to reanimate our country with the blessing of it's reconversion? Why too raise, or why embitter against ourselves the hostility of all other religionists, while we are aiding the efforts of the very worst of enemies, that very now declining and falling party of high churchmen, who were far the most opposed to Catholic Emancipation, and who seem to hope, once more, gaining fetters from ourselves, to chain us to the galley.

"Oxford, March 13th.—Mr. Colquhoun, (says the Morning Chronicle), the opposer of the Maynooth Grant, is at present in close communication with the leaders of the Tract party."

> "Tum vero manifesta fides, Denaumque patescunt
> Insidiæ."

Yes, my Lord, let us only watch with an unprejudiced eye the real sign of the present times, and we must infallibly discover what is the true object of the movement at Oxford. When the *Times Newspaper* promises all its future commendations to Dr. Pusey and his party; when Dr. Hook uprears the standard of this party, and the *Morning Post* blesses the colours; when another violent religious opponent makes the men of the Oxford Convention the great objects of his affectionate veneration, as "the best sons—he might say the fathers of the Church of England"; it does not require the penetration of Laocoon to detect the true object of these people. There is no difficulty in declaring that there is treachery, when we know who are leagued in this conspiracy against us.

Indeed, my Lord, I am sorry to be obliged to add, that some even of the most moderate among the advocates and followers of Puseyism, so often and so perpetually are found blaming the Catholics for their want of a high-toned Conservatism in politics, that I really have for some time seriously apprehended, that even they are aware of the treacherous spirit which animates the whole body of the system; and that there is as much of political as religious knavery in this Oxford movement. Even in that very letter which was lately published in the *Univers*, and copied into the pages of the *Tablet*, the writer blames too virulently the Catholics of England for supporting the present Liberal Administration, for uniting themselves with those whom the writer had the meek charity to designate as "miscreants, schismatics, and seditions;" he denounces but too violently the Liberator of Ireland, though I do not see that he includes, as almost all Puseyites do among the objects of their anathemas, the Catholic Prelacy of Ireland; for me not very much to suspect, that the writer was some mere canting crowing politico-religionist. Of that letter however, my Lord, I must still confess I have formed no decided opinion. Within the last few days however, I have received a long and kind favour from the Rev. Mr. Mason of Stourbridge, who is a distinguished convert to our holy Religion, and whose great experience, as well of the shrewd and quick apprehension of the whole state of the subject in debate, which the whole of his communication manifests, makes his opinion most valuable to me. As he also has forwarded to me an unasked permission to make whatever use I please of his letter, I will beg leave to quote his opinion regarding that document in the *Univers*.

"I do not say, (writes Mr. Mason,) I will not say there are no sincere individuals among the Puseyites; I hope

Mr. Newman and the writer in the *Univers* are such, but I very much doubt it; indeed that letter is such a mawkish imitation of a Saint, that I cannot recognise that sincerity which always marks the productions of a sincere enquirer after truth. I can say for myself, and I think every one who advances from Protestantism towards Catholicity can say with me, that as light breaks upon our minds we do not doubt of Rome, our doubts lie the other way; for we say Rome is right so far; we have been deceived; and being wrong in these points, there is reason to fear that we are wrong in others. We doubt Protestantism as a whole, and suspect that Rome is right. But the writer in the *Univers* calls upon Rome to do penance for her sins, &c. Again—as we advance we doubt of our ministry and ordinances, and are disposed to abandon that ministry and those ordinances. But the writer doubts not of the validity of his Bishop's Episcopal character, though he must have known that it is denied by Catholics; and he says that he and his brethren must wait till their Bishops come round. What, refuse to follow conviction till other men lay down their mitres! I pass over his assertion that the *Primacy is not essential to the Church,* consequently not of divine institution, but grows out of its health and vital heat, as if vital heat ever produced a head to a human body, to which the Church is assimilated. As we approach towards Catholicity our love and respect increases and our violence dies away; but the bulk of these men become more rabid as they become like Rome, *a plain proof of their designs.*"

I will now, my Lord, beg leave to give another very interesting quotation from the letter of this truly zealous and prudent convert; I will do so, not merely because his opinions are similar to the sentiments I have cherished ever since I made myself acquainted with the Puseyite works,

but because I know how much more valuable your Lordship, will feel, must be the opinion of one so well able to form a judgment on this matter, than even any arguments with which I could favour your Lordship.

"Now as to the Puseyites, (says Mr. Mason), I do not believe that they are any nearer the portals of the Catholic Church than the most prejudiced Methodist or Evangelical preacher. They are the High Church party it is true; but what have they not done to prop up the Establishment? They complain of State controul; did they not give the power to the State? Yes, those very men whom they hold up as paragons of excellence, yielded the Episcopal authority to the Prince, and received it back as his vicegerents. Since that, they have modelled and remodelled; reformed and re-reformed, turned in all directions to accomplish a point. Never was there such a Protean animal as the Church established by law. She has been High Church, Low Church, Calvinistical, any thing to serve a turn—and now they want to realize the old fable of the eagle. They want her to fly to the Sun, to scorch off her old feathers, and then dipping herself into the sea, her plumage and strength will be renewed like the eagle's. They wish the ancient Catholic Hierarchy to stoop down that she may lay hold of their robes, and clothe themselves in their mantles while the transformation goes on. They say, we have gone as far from Popery as we could, saving our tithes, our glebes, our surplice and other fees; we have been wrong, for authority is connected with antiquity, and our fathers were wiser than we. They only threw off the authority of Rome, but they kept the Church nearly in statu quo, and thus held the people in obedience. *And what is more, thousands of Catholics,* yea the bulk of the nation *conformed,* and the *incorrigible Romanists were driven out of the land.* Let us

retrace our steps; let us cry up the Church, antiquity, &c.; in fact, let us go back to the days of Cranmer and Harry—to the old mumpsimus and no new sumpsimus—and let us make the *Church dominant* and *Rome prostrate in the dust.* If we do not this, the Dissenters will have the legs of our Mother off, and the Romanists will have her body and her robes. And as we find that Parliamentary control is injurious to our plans, let every man denounce the slavery of the Church, and preaching her divine origin and independence, convince the people, and cause them to unite with us in gaining back our convocation. At the same time, let some cry loudly against Rome, and others invite Rome to do penance with ourselves. Such, Rev. Sir, is an outline of my views on the Oxford movement."—*Stourbridge, April 26th,* 1841.

My Lord, it would be quite useless to add any comments of my own to these acute and able observations, which I know will merit your attention. I might, however, be permitted to add one remark upon the singular opposition that the writer in the *Univers,* and even the most moderate Puseyites, make to our attempts at conversion. They seem so anxious for us to leave their purposes to the workings of Divine Providence, and to confine our attention entirely to our own people. Why this morbid dislike to the zealous efforts of our ministry? If we are in the safe way, why so anxiously pray us not to labour to bring others into the fold? This, my Lord, is a strong feature in Puseyism that must strike any attentive eye, and to my mind presents any thing but a look of sincerity or of good feeling towards us. But, my Lord, may I also say, that *our own Shepherd,* in my humble opinion, has already guarded us against these wolves coming in the clothing of sheep. My Lord, I have in no way tried to elicit an opinion regarding the Puseyites

from our own learned prelate; I know the sentiments of some chief pastors, but I felt the delicacy of directly applying to Dr. Griffiths for an opinion. But, my Lord, I say candidly, I would never have consented to enter the lists against this strange confraternity, and meet them with all my humble abilities and energy, if I did not feel that my own Prelate was opposed to the guile and treachery of these men. My Lord, I may be wrong in the interpretation of them, but the words of the Catholic Bishop of this district have been my principal comfort and support in a most painful and unenviable position, a position I have been placed in by consenting in the first place to obey the wishes of great and good men. My Lord, there is a passage in the Pastoral of Dr. Griffiths for the Lent of 1840, which I could not interpret as denouncing to his Lordship's flock the machinations of any other people, but of this perverse generation of Puseyites; and there are two passages in the New Year's Gift, in the Directory of this year, that have fully convinced me that our Bishop could refer to no other body of men. With your Lordship's permission, I will quote passages from the last document, for however supported I may feel, by the opinions of others, it is to my own Prelate that I have to look up to for instruction in time of difficulty. The first passage I think refers to the approach the Puseyites are making to us in several tenets of religion; the second to their ridiculous attempt to deprive us of our glorious name of Catholic, and to appropriate it to themselves, while they insult us in all their works with the appellations of Romanists, Papists, and such like vulgar designations.

"In every age of the Christian Church," says this document in the Directory, "the awful predictions of St. Paul have been verified; heresiarchs have arisen, *speaking per-*

verse things to draw away disciples after them; ravening wolves have entered in, not sparing the flock. (Acts xx. 29, 30.) Different sects have separated themselves from the lawful pastors, whom Jesus Christ has appointed, as he himself had been sent by his heavenly Father. At their first separation, some leaders of schism have denied a greater number of revealed truths, whilst others have rejected only a few. In their progress they have generally increased the number of their errors, and have been again divided into other branches, as hostile to each other as to the Catholic Church which they had deserted. As time has rolled on, *we occasionally find them acknowledging some truths which they had formerly rejected as errors, and approaching, in particular tenets, nearer the true Church which they had abandoned; but scarcely shall we find a body of schismatics returning with sincerity to the obedience of faith.*"

Again:—"The true Church has no name to designate her origin, but that of *Christian* or *Apostolical;* no term to limit her extent and duration, but that of *Catholic* or *Universal:* because she has never separated herself from any prior-existing church; she has ever remained unmoved, as the great tree, whence the rotten branches of schism and error have fallen or been severed. Modern sects, sensible of their insignificance, when compared with the Church of all ages and nations—feeling acutely, *in their very name*, the bleeding wound of their separation—may, like the Donatists in the fourth century, endeavour to assume the venerable name of *Catholic;* but the jarring sound of Universal confined to England, and Apostolical begun by Henry or Elizabeth, only attract notice by their incongruity, and direct attention to what should be carefully concealed, viz. —their separation from the Catholic Church; *which, how-*

ever nicknamed by short-lived sects, will continue to verify as well as preserve the august title, which designates it in the Apostles' Creed: *I believe—the holy Catholic Church,*" &c.—New Year's Gift for 1841.

My Lord, I repeat, these words struck me as directed against the Puseyites, because they are the men "who acknowledge truths which they formerly rejected as errors"; they are the men who in these days "approach, in particular tenets, nearer the true Church"; they are the only men who now "endeavour to assume the venerable name of Catholic"—for the other portion of the Protestant party object to the title of Anglo-Catholics, which the Puseyites have adopted; and above all others, they are the men who "nickname" us in a vocabulary never till now equalled; and they bid but too fair to realise that observation of his Lordship, which all Church history bears testimony to—"scarcely shall we find a body of schismatics returning with sincerity to the obedience of faith." My Lord, I have always explained these observations as directed against the Puseyites, and I have always felt that my sentiments therefore regarding them, could not vary much from those of my own Bishop.

An opinion, however, my Lord, appears to have arisen among some of our own body, that the Puseyites were led in the first instance by feelings of hostility towards us, to a perusal of the writings of the ancient fathers, in order to obtain new support for the tenets of their party; but discovering in the works of the primitive age more of Catholic truth than they expected to find there, they are now gradually captivating their understandings in obedience to faith. This, my Lord, I have no hesitation in declaring is an unfounded error. The Puseyites manifest the smallest possible modicum of respect for the sage of antiquity when-

ever they meet with passages really opposed to the working of their system. The letter of St. Jerome to Pope Damasus, expressing in terms which cannot be explained away, the divine institution of the Primacy, in the hands of Mr. Palmer is a *mere complimentary epistle,* couched in the terms of flattery. St Leo, and all the other ancient Saints who sat in the chair of St. Peter, "*magnify the privileges of St. Peter beyond the truth,*" vol 2, page 491, on the Church. The fathers are always represented in opposition to each other when they go one step beyond the boundaries prescribed for them by these gentlemen. If we adduce arguments in favour of the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, though we may have some fathers with us, yet they are not those of the three first centuries; they are not unanimous, their authority proves nothing. Moreover, what can be their object in so much depreciating, as they do, the authority of those sainted ones who did not live in the three first centuries of religion? Why allow them only as adequate witnesses to decide upon questions between us? Why are not St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Ephrem, St. Ambrose equally as faithful witnesses as Origen or St. Cyprian? Why deprive us of the testimony of those, who, perhaps, alone have treated upon the point in dispute between us? Would any of us consent to be obliged to confine our arguments from the fathers against the Arians, to witness, of those who preceeded the council of Nice? Does there appear much honesty in this line of proceeding? I put this question to a very enlightened and eminent Clergyman of the Church of England, a high Churchman, but a man of higher honour, and he fairly owned my question was a startling one; that my objection to such a system seemed very fair; and that he certainly felt it had much point. The fathers of the fourth and fifth age, say the

Puseyites, taught more like Rome; but the fathers of the three first centuries were orthodox Anglican Churchmen. And yet even, when during those *three first centuries*, St. Victor presumed to exercise the authority of the primacy, or St. Stephen laid claim to the supremacy of the Holy See, the authority claimed was an usurpation, for it had never been granted to them by our divine Lord and Master. Indeed, my Lord, so far from learning a real respect for the fathers from reading the writings of the Puseyites, I declare most solemnly, that if the Puseyites were my trustworthy instructors, my real respect for the holy sages of antiquity would be very small indeed. I am sure the Puseyite method of treating these illustrious men, is calculated to do anything rather than to gain for them respect; it is the surest means of bringing them into utter contempt.

And now, my Lord, may I make one remark upon the discontinuance of the Tracts, by Mr. Newman, at the request of the Bishop of Oxford. My Lord, any one who knows how much Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman owe to the Bishop of Oxford, could anticipate no other line of acting than has been adopted by these gentlemen, unless we suppose them to be capable of great ingratitude to their best friend and patron. It is to the protection of the Bishop of Oxford they owe their present high position before the public; if it had not been for the kindness of his Lordship, they could not have attained that extraordinary influence which they now possess. Had they not, therefore, not bowed to his Lordship's wishes, besides rendering their livings in the Universities insecure, they would have forfeited their characters. As to the alternative of joining us, such a measure I do not believe was ever dreamt of. They have expressed too much contempt for us to suppose it possible that they can have the slightest affection for our

religion; for we can never love what we despise. They have no desire to embrace our cheerless poverty and humble position. And speaking of Bishops of the establishment, let me passingly remark, that all those on the Episcopal bench, who are in any way kind to us, and who support measures favourable to the persecuted Catholics of Ireland, are all the foes of the Puseyites; whereas the prelate in whose writings we may discover, perhaps, the most of Puseyite principles, is the meek, the kind, the benevolent, and liberal prelate, Dr. Henry Philpotts, Lord Bishop of Exeter. He is the great champion of High Church principles, of Church authority, of the power of the Keys, and even sacerdotal absolution; but I think it does not follow he is the kindest friend we possess.

My Lord, we often hear of the writings of the late Mr. Froude. I own he, as well as all the Puseyites, have placed in our hands very strong and powerful arguments, which we ought to employ against what they were intended to protect. But I must confess, that in the writings even of Mr. Froude, I behold a politico-religious bias, which I can in no way approve, an hostility against us which I cannot commend. Indeed his language against our holy Church and our sacred ministry is not to be borne. If the Puseyites do not become Catholics before Rome becomes such as the followers of Mr. Froude wishes to see it, I am very certain their conversion will not take place at this side of doomsday. "We found, *to our horror* (writes Mr. Froude, vol. 1, page 307), that the doctrines of the infallibility of the Church, made the acts of each successive council obligatory for ever; that what had once been decided could not be meddled with again; in fact, that they were committed finally and irrevocably, and could not advance one step to meet us, even though the Church of England should again become what it was in

Laud's time, or, indeed, what it may have been up to the *atrocious council* (of Trent). I own it has altogether changed my notion of the Roman Catholics, and made me wish for a *total overthrow of the system.*" Again: "The Church of England has fallen low, and will probably be worse before it is better; *but let the Whigs do their worst,* they cannot sink us so deep as these people have allowed themselves to fall while retaining all the superficials of a religious country."—Page 294. I beg to call your attention to this last sentence, as again expressing one of the secrets of the Puseyite system, a wish to destroy that party which has been kind to us, and upon which alone poor Ireland rests all her hopes for peace and good government, and a desire to raise up the old and cruel ascendency. The other passage, which calls the council of Trent *atrocious,* and prays for the *overthrow of our whole religious system,* I cannot think betrays either kind or generous feelings, either to us or our holy creed. But who, my Lord, of all others, are our present most violent literary opponents? Faber, Hook, Sewell, Poole, Palmer, Pusey, Gladstone, and Percival? More than one of these are men of the most splendid talents. Every one of these are Puseyites. Are we to set down in peace while these men bring round our country to Catholicism? Or if we enter the list against these iron-fisted combatants, must we be bound to wear velvet? My Lord, while we are deliberating what we are to do, these men are exulting in victories which they boast they are obtaining over us. Why are we not to display as much zeal, as much courage, as much wit, as much humour, at their expense, as much eloquence, or rather as much of all these advantsges, as we happen to possess, in defending our holy religion, as these men display with such extraor-

dinary power, in their combats against it? For, my Lord, to quote once more from the letter of the Rev. Mr. Mason, "There it as much eloquence, and more zeal, and moral force against Rome, than for it. Will God force the nation to be converted? This he never did. Our first apostles had only Pagan ignorance, barbarism, and idols to contend with; we have Christianity so called, liberty, the Bible, (interpreted as each one thinks best) prejudice supported by interest, and a whole host of other *et ceteras.* When chapels and Churches ring with tirades against our doctrines and Church, when men have their present disposition, assuredly we have a fine prospect for the conversion of England."

My Lord, I may be wrong, and I should think I probably am wrong in the opinion I have formed of the Puseyites, if I did not know, that very many of great abilities and long experience amongst us, and some of high station in the Church, held opinions equally strong upon the insincerity of these people in their pretended approach to true Catholic feelings. But as I have not asked authority to give names, and it would be most highly improper of me to do so without such a permission, I shall say no more upon this point. I already upon another occasion have given certificates at least in favour of the decided part I have taken myself, though, my Lord, I say candidly, I shall never forgive myself for having so done. I yielded to the sentiments of others, who feared that otherwise my cause might be marred by the motives which had been attributed to me, motives of which I am, thank God, entirely incapable.

My Lord, I hope this system of imputing motives, of which the late Bishop Milner often so bitterly complained, will be for ever put an end to. Let us discuss every matter

as gentlemen, and men of high honour and nice feelings. For my own part I cannot but cherish the highest, the very highest sentiments of respect for all those among our own body who have been carried away with what I consider a most fatal delusion upon the subject of Puseyism. I think their very mistake manifests a kind and good heart; I feel it to be an error into which the greatest minds might fall without compromising their character for every virtue and excellence; and let us who are generous to others, meet with a return of manly sympathy.

But, my Lord, if I be wrong in the view I have taken of the movement at Oxford, the persons to set me right are the Puseyites themselves. Let them discontinue their virulent, hateful, and abominable attacks upon the Catholic Priesthood and the Catholic Religion; let them cease maligning the Prelacy and people of Ireland, the kindest and most oppressed people in the world, with a malignant spirit before entirely unknown in the whole range of religious controversy; let them cease to be the slanderers of a nation, and the suborners of calumny against a whole people; let them make real advances to meet us; let them treat our holy Church with respect; let them not bend their knee to the Spouse of the Saviour, and then buffet her in insulting mockery and with cruel blows. No one will rejoice more than I will at this practical reply to my denunciations of this party; no one will more exult in this proof of my mistake; no one more than I, will be glad to see our pens thus stopped and our mouths thus closed. But, my Lord, in your zeal for the Temple of your God, you will grant me, I know, that this is the kind of answer I have a right to expect. I impeach Dr. Pusey and his friends of a deadly hatred of our religion; let them shew me that they revere and love it. I impeach them of an

intemperance against it, that no age yet has been witness to; let them prove by their meek demeanour towards us that I am in error. The good cause then will have triumphed, and my religion will be no longer a bye-word among them.

I have the honour to be, with profound respect,

My dear Lord,

Your most humble Servant,

and most obliged Friend,

JOSEPH RATHBORNE.

Cowes, May 6th, 1811.

P.S. I sincerely hope and pray that the Catholics of England and Ireland will not allow themselves to be mystified. Since the preceding was written, I have, with surprize, seen an assertion made in print, that intelligence has been received from Oxford, stating that there is every prospect of the distinguished members of the Oxford Movement, bringing round the University to the Catholic Religion. From whom has this wonderful news been received? I have no hesitation in saying, from no authority whatever; for within the last few days, I myself have seen a letter in the handwriting of one of the most distinguished divines of the University, which would have fully convinced me, if I had not been previously convinced, that there is as little human probability of the heads of the Movement endeavouring to promote the success of Catholicism, as there is of him, whom they are ever and anon denouncing, Mr. O'Connell, becoming a joint of the Stanley tail. Another report has been circulated, that a correspondence has been opened between the Rev. Mr. Newman, and a member of our own body;—that Mr. Newman has been written to by one of our own body, I believe; that Mr.

Newman may have sent a courteous reply, is not impossible, though I have great reason for thinking he has not even done this. But unless Mr. Newman is capable of telling the most dreadful untruths, he contemplates no step whatever, either by correspondence, or any other means, which may bring about a union with Rome. He declares most solemnly it is his wish to arrest the progress of Catholicism, not to promote it. Once more, therefore, I say, let not the Catholics of England or Ireland allow themselves to be mystified.

May I add—what, my Lord, would the Holy See think of the works of these Puseyites? I have not given you twenty quotations out of a thousand, or ten thousand, which I might adduce, full of language the most odiously insulting to the everlasting chair of St. Peter, and to the eminent and exalted religion of our forefathers. Do you think, my Lord, that any thing would be able to persuade our Holy Father, that their books, or the writers, have any claim upon the respect of our people; that the writers ought to be encouraged by us, as champions of truth who are bringing back our country to Catholic unity? I have no doubt what must be the answer your Lordship must make me. Whatever, therefore, our people may think of me or this letter, I can now happily say:—"Liberari animam meam." May every prosperity and happiness attend your Lordship, and may you be long spared to your admiring friends, to your devoted clergy, and to your beloved flock.

I have the honour to be, with profound respect,
My dear Lord,
Your most humble Servant,
and most obliged friend,
JOSEPH RATHBORNE.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just Published, price 5s.

THE CHURCH

IN ITS

RELATIONS WITH TRUTH AND THE STATE;

A REPLY

TO THE WORK BY

W. E. GLADSTONE, Esq., M.P. for Newark,

ENTITLED

"THE STATE IN ITS RELATIONS WITH THE CHURCH."

INSCRIBED, WITH PERMISSION, TO

DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., M.P. for Dublin.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, ORME, AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

E. Pl. Sh.

A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

RICHARD,

LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD,

ON OCCASION OF No. 90,

IN THE SERIES CALLED

THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

BY J. H. NEWMAN, B.D.

VICAR OF ST. MARY THE VIRGIN'S, OXFORD.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER:

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

MDCCCXLI.

OXFORD: PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

A LETTER,

&c.

My dear Lord,

It may seem strange that, on receipt of a message from your Lordship, I should proceed at once, instead of silently obeying it, to put on paper some remarks of my own on the subject of it; yet, as you kindly permit me to take such a course, with the expectation that I may thereby succeed in explaining to yourself and others my own feelings and intentions in the occurrence which has given rise to your Lordship's interference, I trust to your Lordship's indulgence to pardon me any discursiveness in my style of writing, or appearance of familiarity, or prominent introduction of myself, which may be incidental to the attempt.

Your Lordship's message is as follows: That your Lordship considers that the Tract No. 90. in the Series called the Tracts for the Times, is "objectionable, and may tend to disturb the peace and tranquillity of the Church," and that it is your Lordship's "advice that the Tracts for the Times should be discontinued."

Your Lordship has, I trust, long known quite enough of my feelings towards any such expression of your Lordship's wishes, to be sure I should at

once obey it, though it were ever so painful to me, or contrary to the course I should have taken if left to myself. And I do most readily and cheerfully obey you in this instance; and at the same time express my great sorrow that any writing of mine should be judged objectionable by your Lordship, and of a disturbing tendency, and my hope that in what I write in future I shall be more successful in approving myself to your Lordship.

I have reminded your Lordship of my willingness on a former occasion to submit myself to any wishes of your Lordship, had you thought it advisable at that time to signify them. In your Lordship's Charge in 1838, an allusion was made to the Tracts for the Times. Some opponents of the Tracts said that your Lordship treated them with undue indulgence. I will not imply that your Lordship can act otherwise than indulgently to any one, but certainly I did feel at the time, that in the midst of the kindness you shewed towards me personally, you were exercising an anxious vigilance over my publication, which reminded me of my responsibility to your Lordship. I wrote to the Archdeacon on the subject, submitting the Tracts entirely to your Lordship's disposal. What I thought about your Charge will appear from the words I then used to him. I said, "A Bishop's lightest word *ex Cathedrâ*, is heavy. His judgment on a book cannot be light. It is a rare occurrence." And I offered to withdraw any of the Tracts over which I had control, if I were informed which were those to which your Lordship had objections. I afterwards wrote to your Lordship to this effect: that

"I trusted I might say sincerely, that I should feel a more lively pleasure in knowing that I was submitting myself to your Lordship's expressed judgment in a matter of that kind, than I could have even in the widest circulation of the volumes in question." Your Lordship did not think it necessary to proceed to such a measure, but I felt, and always have felt, that, if ever you determined on it, I was bound to obey.

Accordingly on the late occasion, directly I heard that you had expressed an unfavourable opinion of Tract 90, I again placed myself at your disposal, and now readily submit to the course on which your Lordship has finally decided in consequence of it. I am quite sure that in so doing I am not only fulfilling a duty I owe to your Lordship, but consulting for the well-being of the Church, and benefiting myself.

And now, in proceeding to make some explanations in addition, which your Lordship desires of me, I hope I shall not say a word which will seem like introducing discussion before your Lordship. It would ill become me to be stating private views of my own, and defending them, on an occasion like this. If I allude to what has been maintained in the Tracts, it will not be at all by way of maintaining it in these pages, but in illustration of the impressions and the drift with which they have been written. I need scarcely say they are thought by many to betray a leaning towards Roman Catholic error, and a deficient appreciation of our own truth; and your Lordship wishes me to shew that

these apprehensions have no foundation in fact. This I propose to do, and that by extracts from what I have before now written on the subject, which, while they can be open to no suspicion of having been provided to serve an occasion, will, by being now cited, be made a second time my own.

2. First, however, I hope to be allowed to make one or two remarks by way of explaining some peculiarities in the Tracts which at first sight might appear, if not to tend toward Romanism, at least to alienate their readers from that favoured communion in which God's good providence has placed us.

I know it is a prevalent idea, and entertained by persons of such consideration that it cannot be lightly treated, that many of the Tracts are the writing of persons who either are ignorant of what goes on in the world, and are gratifying their love of antiquarian research or of intellectual exercise at any risk; or, who are culpably reckless of consequences, or even find a satisfaction in the sensation or disturbance which may result from such novelties or paradoxes as they may find themselves in a condition to put forward. It is thought, that the writers in question often have had no aim at all in what they have hazarded, that they did not mean what they said, that they did not know the strength of their own words, and that they were putting forth the first crude notions which came into their minds; or that they were pursuing principles to their consequences as a sort of pastime, and developing their own theories in grave practical mat-

ters, in which no one should move without a deep sense of responsibility. In fact, that whatever incidental or intrinsic excellence there may be in the Tracts, and whatever direct or indirect benefits have attended them, there is much in them which is nothing more or less than mischievous, and convicts its authors of a wanton inconsiderateness towards the feelings of others.

I am very far from saying that there is any one evil temper or motive which may not have its share in any thing that I write myself; and it does not become me to deny the charge as far as it is brought against me, though I am not conscious of its justice. But still I would direct attention to this circumstance, that what persons who are not in the position of the writers of the Tracts set down to wantonness, may have its definite objects, though those objects be not manifest to those who are in other positions. I am neither maintaining that those objects are real, or important, or defensible, or pursued wisely or seasonably; but if they exist in the mind of the writers, I trust they will serve so far as to relieve them from the odious charge of scattering firebrands about without caring for or apprehending consequences.

May I then, without (as I have said) at all assuming the soundness of the doctrines to be mentioned, or by mentioning them seeking indirectly a sanction for them from your Lordship, be allowed to allude to one or two Tracts, merely in illustration of what I have said?

One of the latest Tracts is written upon "The

Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church." It discusses the subject of the mystical interpretation of nature and Scripture with a learning and seriousness which no one will wish to deny; but the question arises, and has actually been asked, why discuss it at all? why startle and unsettle the Christian of this age by modes of thought which are now unusual and strange; and which being thus fixed upon the Fathers, serve but to burden with an additional unpopularity an authority which the Church of England has ever revered, ever used in due measure to support her own claims upon the attachment of her children? But the state of the case has been this. For some years the argument in favour of our Church drawn from Antiquity has been met by the assertion, that that same Antiquity held also other opinions which no one now would think of maintaining; that if it were mistaken in one set of opinions, it might be in the other; that its mistakes were of a nature which argued feebleness of intellect, or unsoundness of judgment, or want of logical acumen in those who held them, which would avail against its authority in the instance in which it was used, as well as in that in which it was passed over. Moreover it was said that those who used it in defence of the Church knew this well, but were not honest enough to confess it. They were challenged to confess or deny the charges thus brought against the Fathers; and, since to deny the fact was supposed impossible, they were bid to draw out a case, such, as either to admit of a defence of the fact on grounds of reason,

or of its surrender without surrendering the authority of the Fathers altogether.

Such challenges, and they have not been unfrequent, afford, I conceive, a sufficient reason for any one who considers that the Church of England derives essential assistance from Christian antiquity in her interpretation of Scripture, to enter upon the examination of the particular objections by which certain authors have assailed its authority. Yet it is plain that by those who had not heard of their writings, such an examination would be considered a wanton mooting of points which no one had called in question.

Again, much animadversion has been expressed, and in quarters which claim the highest deference, upon the Tract upon "Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge." Yet I do not think it will be called a wanton exercise of ingenuity. Not only does it bear marks, which no reader can mistake, of deep earnestness, but it in fact originated in a conviction in the mind of the writer of certain actual evils at present resulting from the defective appreciation with which the mass of even religious men regard the mysteries and privileges of the Gospel.

And another Tract, which has experienced a great deal of censure, is that which is made up of Selections from the Roman Breviary. I will not here take upon me to say a word in its defence, except to rescue its author from the charge of wantonness. He had observed what a very powerful source of attraction the Church of Rome possessed in her devotional Services, and he wished, judiciously or

not, to remove it by claiming it for ourselves. He was desirous of shewing, that such Devotions would be but a continuation in private of those public Services which we use in Church; and that they might be used by individuals with a sort of fitness, (removing such portions as were against the Anglican creed or practice,) *because* they were a continuation. He said, in the opening of the Tract,

"It will be attempted to wrest a weapon out of our adversaries' hands; who have in this, as in many other instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure which was ours as much as theirs.... It may suggest.... character and matter for our private devotions, over and above what our Reformers have thought fit to adopt into our public Services; a use of it which will be but carrying out and completing what they have begun." *Tract* 75.

I repeat it, that I have no intention here of defending the proceeding except from the charge of wantonness; and with that view I would add, that though there is a difference not to be mistaken between a book published by authority and an anonymous Tract, yet, as far as its object is concerned, it is not very unlike the publication of Bishop Cosin's Hours of Prayer, of which I hope I may be permitted to remind your Lordship in the words of the recent Editor.

"At the first coming of the Queen Henrietta into England, she and her French ladies, it appears, were equally surprised and dissatisfied at the disregard of the hours of Prayer, and the want of Breviaries. Their remarks, and perhaps the strength of their arguments, and the beauty of many of their books, induced the Protestant ladies of the house-

hold, to apply to King Charles. The King consulted Bishop White as to the best plan of supplying them with Forms of Prayer, collected out of already approved Forms. The Bishop assured him of the ease and the great necessity of such a work, and chose Cosin as the fittest person to frame the Manual. He at once undertook it, and in three months finished it and brought it to the King. The Bishop of London (Mountain), who was commanded to read it over and make his report, is said to have liked it so well, that instead of employing a Chaplain as was usual, he gave it an "*imprimatur*" under his own hand. There were at first only two hundred copies printed. There was, as Evelyn tells us, nothing of Cosin's own composure, nor any name set as author to it, but those necessary prefaces, &c., touching the times and seasons of Prayer, all the rest being entirely translated and collected out of an Office published by authority of Queen Elizabeth and out of our own Liturgy. 'This,' adds Evelyn, 'I rather mention to justify that industrious and pious Dean, who had exceedingly suffered by it, as if he had done it of his own head to introduce Popery, from which no man was more averse, and who was one who, in this time of temptation and apostasy, held and confirmed many to our Church.'

"The book soon grew into esteem, and justified the judgment which had been passed upon it, so that many who were at first startled at the title, 'found in the body of it so much piety, such regular forms of divine worship, such necessary consolations in special exigencies, that they reserved it by them as a jewel of great price and value.' 'Not one book,' it was said, 'was in more esteem with the Church of England, next to the Office of the Liturgy itself.' It appears, in fact, to have become exceedingly popular, and ran through ten editions, the last of which was published in 1719." *Preface to Cosin's Devotions, p.* xi.—xiii.

3. There has been another, and more serious pecu-

liarity in the line of discussion adopted in the Tracts, which, whatever its merits or demerits, has led to their being charged, I earnestly hope groundlessly, with wanton innovation on things established. I mean the circumstance that they have attempted to defend our Ecclesiastical system upon almost first principles. The *immediate* argument for acquiescing in what is established is that it *is* established: but when what has been established is in course of alteration, (and this evil was partly realised, and feared still more, eight years since,) the argument ceases, and then one is driven to considerations which are less safe because less investigated, which it is impossible at once to survey in all their bearings, or to have confidence in, that they will not do a disservice to the cause we are defending as well as a benefit. It seemed safe at the period in question, when the immediate and usual arguments failed, to recur to those which were used by our divines in the seventeenth century, and by the most esteemed in the century which followed, and down to this day. But every existing establishment, whatever be its nature, is a *fact*, a thing *sui simile*, which cannot be resolved into any one principle, nor can be defended and built up upon one idea. Its position is the result of a long history, which has moulded it, and stationed it, in the form and place which characterize it. It has grown into what it is by the influence of a number of concurrent causes in time past, and in consequence no one first principle can be urged in its defence, but what in some other respect or measure may also possibly be urged against it. This applies, I conceive, as to

all social institutions, so to the case of our religious establishment and system at this day. It is a matter of extreme difficulty and delicacy, to say the least, so to defend them in an argumentative discussion in one respect as not to tend to unsettle them in another. And all but minds of the greatest powers, or even genius, will find nothing left to them, if they do attempt it, but to strike a balance between gain and loss, and to attempt to do the most good on the whole.

I hope I shall not be misunderstood as if, in thus speaking, I meant to justify to your Lordship the consequences which have followed under these circumstances from the attempts of the Tracts for the Times in defence of the Church. I am but shewing that, even though evil has resulted, it need not have been wanton evil. Nor am I at all insinuating, that our established system is necessarily in fault, because it was exposed to this inconvenience; rather, as I have said, the cause lies in the nature of things, abstract principles being no sufficient measure of matters of fact. There cannot be a clearer proof of this than will be found in a reference to that antagonist system, which it has been the object of the Tracts in so great a measure to oppose. I do not put the case of Rome and her defenders as parallel to that between the Tracts and our own Church, of course; it would be preposterous to do so; but it may avail as an *à fortiori* argument, considering how systematic and complete the Roman system is, and what transcendent ability is universally allowed to Bossuet. Yet even Bossuet,

so great a controversialist, could not defend Romanism, so perfect a system, without doing a harm while he did a service. At least we may fairly conclude, that what the authorities of the Church of Rome thought to be a disservice to it, really was so at the time, though in the event it might prove a benefit. Dr. Maclaine in a note on his translation of Mosheim, observes of Bossuet's Exposition: "It is remarkable that nine years passed before this book could obtain the Pope's approbation. Clement X. refused it positively. Nay, several Roman Catholic Priests were rigorously treated and severely persecuted for preaching the doctrine contained in the Exposition of Bossuet, which was moreover formally condemned by the University of Louvain in the year 1685, and declared to be scandalous and pernicious. The Sorbonne also disavowed the doctrine contained in that book." (Vol. v. p. 126.)

I am not presuming to draw an illustration from the history of Bossuet, except as regards his intention and its result. No one can accuse him of wantonness. What happened to him in spite of great abilities, may happen to others in defect of them.

Several obvious illustrations may be given from the controversies to which the Tracts for the Times have given rise. Much attention, for instance, has of late years been paid by learned men to the question of the origin of our public Services. The Tracts have made use of the results of their investigations with a view of exalting our ideas of the

sacredness of our Eucharistical Rite; but in proportion as they have discerned what may be truly called an awful light resting on its component parts, they have discovered also that those parts have experienced some change in their disposition and circumstances by the hand of time; and accordingly, the higher appreciation the Tracts tend to create of the substance of the Service in the minds of their readers, the greater regret do they incidentally infuse, were they ever so unwilling to do so, that any external causes should have interfered with the shape in which we at this day receive it. The effect then has been to raise our reverence towards the whole indefinitely, yet to fling around that reverence somewhat of a melancholy feeling. I am not defending either process or result, but shewing how good and evil have gone together.

Again, as regards the doctrine of Purgatory, that the present Roman doctrine was not Catholically received in the first ages, is as clear as any fact of history. But there is an argument which Roman controversialists use in its favour, founded on a fact of very early antiquity, the practice of praying for the faithful departed. To meet this objection, the Tracts gave a reprint of Archbishop Ussher's chapter on the subject in his Answer to a Jesuit, in which he shews that the objects of those prayers were very different from those which the Roman doctrine of Purgatory requires. Thus the argument in question is effectually overthrown, but at the expense of incidentally bringing to light a primitive practice confessedly uncongenial to our present views of reli-

gion. In other words, if the Churchman is by the result of the discussion confirmed against Romanism, he has been incidentally, and for the moment, (I cannot deny it,) unsettled in some of his existing opinions.

Or again, the charge brought against the defenders of Baptismal Regeneration has commonly been, that such a doctrine explained away regeneration, and made a mere name and a shadow of that gift of which Scripture speaks so awfully. We answer, "So far from it, every one is in a worse condition for being regenerate, if he is not in a better. If he resist the grace he has received, it is a burden to him, not a blessing. He cannot take it for granted, that all is right with the soul, and think no more about it; for the gift involves responsibilities as well as privileges." And thus, while engaged in maintaining the truth, that all Christians are in a state of grace, we incidentally elicit the further truth, that sin after Baptism is a heavier matter than sin before it: or, in maintaining the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, we introduce the doctrine of repentance. We fortify our brethren in one direction; and may be charged with unsettling them in another.

Or again, in defending such doctrines and practices of the Church as Infant Baptism or the Episcopal Succession, the Tracts have argued that they rested on substantially the same basis as the Canon of Scripture, viz. the testimony of ancient Christendom. But to those who think this basis weak, the argument becomes a disparagement of the Canon, not a recommendation of the Creed.

My Lord, I have not said a word to imply that this disturbing and unsettling process is indissolubly connected with argumentative efforts in defence of our own system. I only say, that the good *naturally* runs into the evil; and so, without entering into the question whether or how they might have been kept apart in the Tracts, I am accounting for what looks like wantonness, yet I trust is not.

And perhaps I may be permitted to add, that our difficulties are much increased in a place like this, where there are a number of persons of practised intellects, who with or without unfriendly motives are ever drawing out the ultimate conclusions in which our principles result, and forcing us to affirm or deny what we would fain not consider or not pronounce upon. I am not complaining of this as unfair to us at all, but am shewing that we may have said extreme things, yet not from any wanton disregard of the feelings and opinions of others. The appeal is made to reason, and reason has its own laws, and does not depend on our will to take the more or less; and this is not less the case as regards the result, even though it be false reason which we follow, and our conclusions be wrong from our failing to detect the counteracting considerations which would avert the principles we hold from the direction in which we pursue them. And a conscientious feeling sometimes operates to keep men from concealing a conclusion which they think they see involved in their principles, and which others see not; and moreover a dread of appearing disingenuous

to others, who are directing their minds to the same subjects.

An instance has occurred in point quite lately as regards a subject introduced into Tract 90, which I am very glad to have an opportunity of mentioning to your Lordship. I have said in the Postscript of a Letter which I have lately addressed to Dr. Jelf, that the "vagueness and deficiency" of some parts of the Tract, in the conclusions drawn from the premises stated, arose in great measure from the author's being "more bent on laying down his principle than defining its results." In truth I was very unwilling to commit the view of the Articles which I was taking, to any precise statement of the ultimate approaches towards the Roman system allowed by our own. To say *how far* a person may go, is almost to tempt him to go up to the boundary line. I am far from denying that an evil arose from the vagueness which ensued, but it arose mainly from this feeling. Accordingly I left, for instance, the portion which treated of the Invocation of Saints without any definite conclusion at all, after bringing together various passages in illustration. However, friends and opponents discovered that my premises required, what I was very unwilling to state categorically, for various reasons, that the *ora pro nobis* was not on my shewing necessarily included in the invocation of Saints which the Article condemns. And in my Letter to Dr. Jelf, I have been obliged to declare this, under a representation that to pass it over would be considered disingenuous. I avail myself, however, of

the opportunity which this Letter to your Lordship affords me, without any suggestion as your Lordship knows, from yourself, or from any one else, to state as plainly as I can, lest my brethren should mistake me, my great apprehension concerning the use even of such modified invocations. Every feeling which interferes with God's sovereignty in our hearts, is of an idolatrous nature; and, as men are tempted to idolize their rank and substance, or their talent, or their children, or themselves, so may they easily be led to substitute the thought of Saints and Angels for the one supreme idea of their Creator and Redeemer, which should fill them. It is nothing to the purpose to urge the example of such men as St. Bernard in defence of such invocations. The holier the man, the less likely are they to be injurious to him; but it is another matter entirely when ordinary persons do the same. There is much less of awe and severity in the devotion which rests upon created excellence as its object, and worldly minds will gladly have recourse to it, to be saved the necessity of lifting up their eyes to their Sanctifier and Judge. And the multitude of men are incapable of many ideas; one is enough for them, and if the image of a Saint is admitted into their heart, he occupies it, and there is no room for Almighty God. And moreover there is the additional danger of *presumptuousness* in addressing Saints and Angels; by which I mean cases when men do so from a sort of curiosity, as the heathen might feel towards strange and exciting rites of worship, not with a clear conscience and spontane-

ously, but rather with certain doubts and misgivings about its propriety, and a secret feeling that it does not become them, and a certain forcing of themselves in consequence.

4. Unless your Lordship had ordered me to speak my mind on these subjects, I should feel that in these reflections I was adopting a tone very unlike that which becomes a private Clergyman addressing his Diocesan; but, encouraged by the notion that I am obeying your wishes, I will proceed in what I feel it very strange to allow myself in, though I do so. And, since I have been naturally led into the subject of Romanism, I will continue it, and explain the misapprehension which has been entertained of my views concerning it.

I do not wonder that persons who happen to fall upon certain writings of mine, and are unacquainted with others, and, as is natural, do not understand the sense in which I use certain words and phrases, should think that I explain away the differences between the Roman system and our own, which I hope I do not. They find in what I have written, no abuse, at least I trust not, of the individual Roman Catholic, nor of the Church of Rome, viewed abstractedly as a Church. I cannot speak against the Church of Rome, viewed in her formal character, as a true Church, since she is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-stone." Nor can I speak against her private members, numbers of whom, I trust, are God's people, in the way to Heaven, and one with us in heart, though not in profession. But what

I have spoken, and do strongly speak against is, that energetic system and engrossing influence in the Church *by which* it acts towards us, and meets our eyes, like a cloud filling it, to the eclipse of all that is holy, whether in its ordinances or its members. This system I have called in what I have written, Romanism or Popery, and by Romanists or Papists I mean all its members, so far as they are under the power of these principles; and while, and so far as this system exists, and it does exist now as fully as heretofore, I say that we can have no peace with that Church, however we may secretly love its particular members. I cannot speak against its private members; I should be doing violence to every feeling of my nature if I did, and your Lordship would not require it of me. I wish from my heart we and they were one; but we cannot, without a sin, sacrifice truth to peace; and, in the words of Archbishop Laud, "till Rome be other than it is" we must be estranged from her.

This view which, not inconsistently, I hope, with our chief divines, I would maintain against the Roman errors, seems to me to allow at once of zeal for the truth, and charity towards individuals and towards the Church of Rome herself. It presents her under a twofold aspect, and while recognizing her as an appointment of God on the one hand, it leads us practically to shun her, as beset with heinous and dangerous influences on the other. It is drawn out in the following extracts, under which I have thought it best to set it before your Lordship, rather than in statements made for the occasion, for the

reason I have given above. I think they will serve to shew, consistently with those which I made in my Letter to Dr. Jelf, both the real and practical stand I would make against Romanism, yet the natural opening there is for an unfounded suspicion that I feel more favourably towards it than I do.

"Our controversy with Romanists," I say, "turns more upon facts than upon first principles; with Protestant sectaries it is more about principles than about facts. This general contrast between the two religions, which I would not seem to extend beyond what the sober truth warrants, for the sake of an antithesis, is paralleled in the common remark of our most learned controversialists, that Romanism *holds the foundation*, or *is the truth overlaid with corruptions*. This is saying the same thing in other words. They discern in it the great outlines of primitive Christianity, but they find them touched, if nothing worse, touched and tainted by error, and so made dangerous to the multitude,—dangerous except to men of spiritual minds, who can undo the evil, arresting the tendencies of the system by their own purity, and restoring it to the sweetness and freshness of its original state. The very force of the word *corruption*, implies that this is the peculiarity of Romanism. All error indeed of whatever kind, may be called a corruption of truth; still we properly apply the term to such kinds of error as are not denials but perversions, distortions, or excesses of it. Such is the relation of Romanism towards true Catholicity. . . . .

"The same view of Romanism is implied, when we call our ecclesiastical changes in the sixteenth century a Reformation. A building has not been reformed or repaired, when it has been pulled down and built up again; but the word is used when it has been left substantially what it was before, only amended or restored in detail. In like manner we Anglo-Catholics do not profess a different religion from

the Romanists, we profess their Faith *all but* their corruptions.

"Again, this same character of Romanism as a perversion, not a contradiction of Christian Truth, is confessed as often as members of our Church in controversy with it contend, as they may rightly do, that it must be judged, not by the formal decrees of the Council of Trent, as its advocates are fond of doing, but by its practical working and its existing state in the countries which profess it. Romanists would fain confine us in controversy to the consideration of the bare and acknowledged principles of their Church; we consider this to be an unfair restriction; why? because we conceive that Romanism is far more faulty in its details than in its formal principles, and that Councils, to which its adherents would send us, have more to do with its abstract system than with its practical working; that the abstract system contains, for the most part, *tendencies* to evil, which the actual working brings out, thus supplying illustrations of that evil which is really though latently contained in principles capable in themselves of an honest interpretation. Thus for instance, the decree concerning Purgatory might be charitably made almost to conform to the doctrine of St. Austin, or St. Chrysostom, were it not for the comment on it afforded by the popular belief as existing in those countries which hold it, and by the opinions of the Roman schools." *On Romanism*, p. 50—54.

Again,

"I have been speaking of Romanism, not as an existing political sect among us, but considered in itself, in its abstract system, and in a state of quiescence. Viewed indeed in action, and as realized in its present partisans, it is but one out of the many denominations which are the disgrace of our age and country. In temper and conduct it does but resemble that unruly Protestantism which lies on our other side, and it submits without reluctance to be

allied and to act with it towards the overthrow of a purer religion .... The reproach of the present Romanists, is that they are inconsistent; and it is a reproach which is popularly felt to be just. They are confessedly unlike the loyal men who rallied round the throne of our first Charles, or who fought, however ill-advisedly, for his exiled descendants .... I have here considered Romanism in its abstract professions for two reasons. First, I would willingly believe, that in spite of the violence and rancour of its public supporters, there are many individuals in its communion of gentle, affectionate, and deeply religious minds; and such a belief is justified when we find that the *necessary* difference between us and them is not one of essential principle, that it is the difference of superstition, and not of unbelief, from religion. Next, I have insisted upon it, by way of shewing what must be the nature of their Reformation, if in God's merciful counsels a Reformation awaits them. It will be far more a reform of their popular usages and opinions, and Ecclesiastical policy, or a destruction of what is commonly called Popery, than of their abstract principles and maxims." *On Romanism, p.* 56, 57.

And again,

"They profess to appeal to primitive Christianity; we honestly take their ground, as holding it ourselves; but when the controversy grows animated, and descends into details, they suddenly leave it, and desire to finish the dispute on some other field. In like manner in their teaching and acting, they begin as if in the name of all the Fathers at once, but will be found in the sequel to prove, instruct, and enjoin, simply in their own name. Our differences from them, considered not in theory but in fact, are in no sense matters of detail and questions of degree. In truth, there is a tenet in their theology which assumes quite a new position in relation to the rest, when we pass from the abstract and quiescent theory to the practical workings of the

system. The infallibility of the existing Church is then found to be its first principle, whereas, before, it was a necessary, but a secondary doctrine. Whatever principles they profess in theory, resembling or coincident with our own, yet when they come to particulars, when they have to prove this or that article of their creed, they supersede the appeal to Scripture and Antiquity by the pretence of the infallibility of the Church, thus solving the whole question, by a summary and final interpretation both of Antiquity and of Scripture." *On Romanism, p.* 59, 60.

In the following passage the Anglican and Roman systems are contrasted with each other.

"Both we and Romanists hold that the Church Catholic is unerring in its declarations of Faith, or saving doctrine; but we differ from each other as to what is the faith, and what is the Church Catholic. They maintain that faith depends on the Church, we that the Church is built on the faith. By Church Catholic, we mean the Church Universal, as descended from the Apostles; they those branches of it which are in communion with Rome. They consider the see of St. Peter, to have a promise of permanence; we the Church Catholic and Apostolic. Again, they understand by the Faith, whatever the Church at any time declares to be faith; we what it has actually so declared from the beginning. We hold that the Church Catholic will never depart from those outlines of doctrine, which the Apostles formally published; they that she will never depart in any of her acts from that entire system, written and oral, public and private, explicit and implicit, which they received and taught; we that she has a gift of fidelity, they of discrimination.

"Again, both they and we anathematize those who deny the Faith; but they extend the condemnation to all who question any decree of the Roman Church; we apply it to those only who deny any article of the original Apostolic Creed. The creed of Romanism is ever subject to

increase; ours is fixed once for all. We confine our anathema to the Athanasian Creed; Romanists extend it to Pope Pius's. They cut themselves off from the rest of Christendom; we cut ourselves off from no branch, not even from themselves. We are at peace with Rome as regards the essentials of faith; but she tolerates us as little as any sect or heresy. We admit her Baptism and her Orders; her custom is" [conditionally] "to re-baptize and re-ordain our members who chance to join her." *On Romanism*, p. 259, 260.

And I shew, in one of the Tracts, the unfairness of detaching the Canons of Trent from the actual conduct of the Roman Church for any practical purposes, while things are as they are, as follows:—

"An equally important question remains to be discussed; *viz.* What the *sources* are, whence we are to gather our opinions of Popery. Here the Romanists complain of their opponents, that, instead of referring to the authoritative documents of their Church, Protestants avail themselves of any errors or excesses of individuals in it, as if the Church were responsible for acts and opinions which it does not enjoin. Thus the legends of relics, superstitions about images, the cruelty of particular Prelates or Kings, or the accidental fury of a populace, are unfairly imputed to the Church itself.... Accordingly they claim to be judged by their formal documents, especially by the decrees of the Council of Trent.

"Now here we shall find the truth to lie between the two contending parties. Candour will oblige us to grant that the mere acts of individuals should not be imputed to the body;...yet not so much as they themselves desire. For though the acts of individuals are not the acts of the Church, yet they may be the results, and therefore illustrations, of its principles. We cannot consent then to confine ourselves to a mere reference to the text of the Tridentine

decrees, as Romanists would have us, apart from the teaching of their Doctors, and the practice of the Church, which are surely the legitimate comment upon them. The case stands as follows. A certain system of teaching and practice has existed in the Churches of the Roman Communion for many centuries; this system was discriminated and fixed in all its outlines at the Council of Trent. It is therefore not unnatural, or rather it is the procedure we adopt in any historical research, to take the general opinions and conduct of the Church in elucidation of their Synodal decrees; just as we take the tradition of the Church Catholic and Apostolic as the legitimate interpreter of Scripture, or of the Apostles' Creed. On the other hand, it is as natural that these decrees, being necessarily concise and guarded, should be much less objectionable than the actual system they represent. It is not wonderful then, yet it is unreasonable, that Romanists should protest against our going beyond these decrees in adducing evidence of their Church's doctrine, on the ground that nothing more than an assent to them is requisite for communion with her: *e. g.* the Creed of Pope Pius, which is framed upon the Tridentine decrees, and is the Roman Creed of Communion, only says, 'I firmly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that souls therein detained are aided by the prayers of the faithful,' nothing being said of its being a place of punishment, nothing, or all but nothing, which does not admit of being explained of merely an intermediate state.

"Now supposing we found ourselves in the Roman Communion, of course it would be a great relief to find that we were not bound to believe more than this vague statement, nor should we (I conceive) on account of the received interpretation about Purgatory superadded to it, be obliged to leave our Church. But it is another matter entirely, whether we who are external to that Church, are not bound to consider it as one whole system, written and unwritten,

defined indeed and adjusted by general statements, but not limited to them or coincident with them.

"The conduct of the Catholics during the troubles of Arianism, affords us a parallel case and a direction in this question. The Arian Creeds were often quite unexceptionable, differing from the orthodox only in this, that they omitted the celebrated word *Homoüsion*, and in consequence did not obviate the possibility of that perverse explanation of them, which in fact their framers adopted. Why then did the Catholics refuse to subscribe them? Why did they rather submit to banishment from one end of the Roman world to the other? Why did they become Confessors and Martyrs? The answer is ready. They interpreted the language of the creeds by the professed opinions of their framers. They would not allow error to be introduced into the Church by an artifice. On the other hand, when at Ariminum they were seduced into a subscription of one of these creeds, though unobjectionable in its wording, their opponents instantly triumphed, and circulated the news that the Catholic world had come over to their opinion. It may be added that, in consequence, ever since that era, phrases have been banished from the language of theology which heretofore had been innocently used by orthodox teachers.

"Apply this to the case of Romanism. We are not indeed allowed to take at random the accidental doctrine or practice of this or that age, as an explanation of the decrees of the Latin Church; but when we see clearly that certain of these decrees have a natural tendency to produce certain evils, when we see those evils actually existing far and wide in that Church, in different nations and ages, existing especially where the system is allowed to act most freely, and only absent where external checks are present, sanctioned moreover by its celebrated teachers and expositors, and advocated by its controversialists with the tacit consent of the whole body, under such circumstances

surely it is not unfair to consider our case parallel to that of the Catholics during the ascendancy of Arianism. Surely it is not unfair in such a case to interpret the formal document of belief by the realized form of it in the Church, and to apprehend that, did we express our assent to the creed of Pope Pius, we should find ourselves bound hand and foot, as the Fathers at Ariminum, to the corruptions of those who profess it.

"To take the instances of the Adoration of Images and the Invocation of Saints. The Tridentine Decree declares that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the Saints, and that the Images of Christ, and the Blessed Virgin, and the other Saints should 'receive due honour and veneration;' words, which themselves go to the very verge of what could be received by the cautious Christian, though possibly admitting of a honest interpretation. Now we know in matter of fact that in various parts of the Roman Church, a worship approaching to idolatrous is actually paid to Saints and Images, in countries very different from each other, as for instance, Italy and the Netherlands, and has been countenanced by eminent men and doctors, and that without any serious or successful protest from any quarter: further that, though there may be countries where no scandal of the kind exists, yet these are such as have, in their neighbourhood to Protestantism, a practical restraint upon the natural tendency of their system.

"Moreover, the silence which has been observed, age after age, by the Roman Church, as regards these excesses, is a point deserving of serious attention;—for two reasons: first, because of the very solemn warnings pronounced by our Lord and His Apostle, against those who introduce scandals into the Church, warnings which seem almost prophetic of such as exist in the Latin branches of it. Next it must be considered that the Roman Church has had the power to denounce and extirpate them. Not to mention its use of its Apostolical powers in other matters, it has had the civil

power at its command, as it has shewn in the case of errors which less called for its interference; all of which shews it has not felt sensitively on the subject of this particular evil." —*Tracts for the Times, No.* 71. p. 14—18.

And in the following passage, written in the course of last year, the contrariety between the Primitive and Roman systems is pointed out.

"Allowing the Church Catholic ever so much power over the faith, allowing that it may add what it will, so that it does not contradict what has been determined in former times, yet let us come to the plain question, Does the Church, according to Romanists, know more now than the Apostles knew? Their theory seems to be that the whole faith was present in the minds of the Apostles, nay, of all Saints at all times, but in great measure as a matter of mere temper, feeling, and unconscious opinion, or implicitly, not in the way of exact statements and in an intellectual form. All men certainly hold a number of truths and act on them, without knowing it; when a question is asked about them, then they are obliged to reflect what their opinion has ever been, and they bring before themselves and assent to doctrines which before were but latent within them. We have all heard of men changing to so-called Unitarianism, and confessing on a review of themselves that they had been Unitarians all along without knowing it, till some accident tore the bandage off their eyes. In like manner the Roman Catholics, we suppose, would maintain that the Apostles were implicit Tridentines; that the Church held in the first age what she holds now; only that heresy, by raising questions, has led to her throwing her faith into dogmatic shape, and has served to precipitate truths which before were held in solution. Now this is all very well in the abstract, but let us return to the point, as to what the Apostles held and did, and what they did not. Does the Romanist mean, for instance, to tell us that St. Paul the

Apostle, when he was in perils of robbers or perils by the sea, offered up his addresses to St. Mary, and vowed some memorial to her, if she would be pleased 'deprecari pro illo Filium Dei?' Does he mean to say that the same Apostle, during that period of his life when as yet he was not 'perfect' or had 'attained,' was accustomed to pray that the merits of St. John the Baptist should be imputed to him? Did he or did he not hold that St. Peter could give indulgences to shorten the prospective sufferings of the Corinthians in purgatory? We do not deny that St. Paul certainly does bring out his thoughts only in answer to express questions asked, and according to the occasion; that St. John has written a Gospel, as later, so also more dogmatic, than his fellow-Evangelists, in consequence of the rise of heresy. We do not at all mean to affirm, that the sacred writers said out at one time all they had to say. There are many things we can *imagine* them doing and holding, which yet, in matter of fact, we believe they did not do, or did not hold. We can *imagine* them administering extreme unction or wearing copes. Again, there are many things which they *could* neither hold nor do, merely from the circumstances of the times or the moment. They could not determine whether general councils might or might not be held without the consent of Princes, or determine the authority of the Vulgate before it was written, or enjoin infant baptism before Christians had children, or decide upon the value of heretical baptism before there were heretics, and before those heretics were baptized. But still there are limits to these concessions; we cannot imagine an Apostle saying and doing what Romanists say and do: can they imagine it themselves? Do they themselves, for instance, think that St. Paul was in the habit of saying what Bellarmine and others say,—*Laus Deo Virginique Matri?* Would they not pronounce a professed epistle of St. Paul's which contained these words spurious on this one ground?"

It is commonly urged by Romanists, that the Notes of their Church are sufficiently clear to enable the private Christian to dispense with argument in joining their Communion in preference to any other. Now in the following passage it is observed, that that Communion has Notes of error upon it, serving in practice quite as truly as a guide from it, as the Notes which it brings forward can be made to tell in its favour.

"Our Lord said of false prophets, 'By their fruits shall ye know them;' and, however the mind may be entangled theoretically, yet surely it will fall upon certain marks in Rome which seem intended to convey to the simple and honest enquirer a solemn warning to keep clear of her, while she carries them about her. Such are her denying the Cup to the laity, her idolatrous worship of the Blessed Virgin, her Image-worship, her recklessness in anathematizing, and her schismatical and overbearing spirit. Surely we have more reason for thinking that her doctrines concerning Images and the Saints are false, than that her saying they are Apostolical is true. I conceive, then, on the whole, that while Rome confirms by her accordant witness our own teaching in all greater things, she does not tend by her novelties, and violence, and threats, to disturb the practical certainty of Catholic doctrine, or to seduce from us any sober and conscientious enquirer." *On Romanism*, p. 324, 325.

And in one of the Tracts for the Times, speaking of certain Invocations in the Breviary, I say,

"These portions of the Breviary carry with them their own plain condemnation, in the judgment of an English Christian; no commendation of the general structure and matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency to reconcile him to them; and it has been the strong feeling

that this is really the case, that has led the writer of these pages fearlessly and securely to admit the real excellencies, and to dwell upon the antiquity of the Roman Ritual. He has felt that, since the Romanists required an unqualified assent to the *whole* of the Breviary, and that there were passages which no Anglican ever could admit, praise the true Catholic portion of it as much as he might, he did not in the slightest degree approximate to a recommendation of Romanism." *Tract* 75. p. 9, 10.

"They" [the Antiphons to the blessed Virgin] "shall be here given in order to shew clearly, as a simple inspection of them will suffice to do, the utter contrariety between the Roman system, as actually existing, and our own; which, however similar in certain respects, are in others so at variance, as to make any attempt to reconcile them together in their present state, perfectly nugatory. Till Rome moves towards us, it is quite impossible that we should move towards Rome; however closely we may approximate to her in particular doctrines, principles, or views." *Tract* 75. p. 23.

In the foregoing passages, protests will be found against the Roman worship of St. Mary, Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, Purgatory, Denial of the Cup, Indulgences, and Infallibility; besides those which are entered against the fundamental theory out of which these errors arise.

5. And now having said, I trust, as much as your Lordship requires on the subject of Romanism, I will add a few words, to complete my explanation, in acknowledgment of the inestimable privilege I feel in being a member of that Church over which your Lordship, with others, presides. Indeed, did I not feel it to be a privilege which I am able to seek no

where else on earth, why should I be at this moment writing to your Lordship? What motive have I for an unreserved and joyful submission to your authority, but the feeling that the Church in which your Lordship rules is a divinely-ordained channel of supernatural grace to the souls of her members? Why should I not prefer my own opinion, and my own way of acting, to that of the Bishop's, except that I know full well that in matters indifferent I should be acting lightly towards the Spouse of Christ and the Awful Presence which dwells in her, if I hesitated a moment to put your Lordship's will before my own? I know full well that your Lordship's kindness to me personally, would be in itself quite enough to win any but the most insensible heart, and, did a clear matter of conscience occur in which I felt bound to act for myself, my feelings towards your Lordship would be a most severe trial to me, independently of the higher considerations to which I have alluded; but I trust I have shewn my dutifulness to you prior to the influence of personal motives; and this I have done because I think that to belong to the Catholic Church is the first of all privileges here below, as involving in it heavenly privileges, and because I consider the Church over which your Lordship presides to be the Catholic Church in this country. Surely then I have no need to profess in words, I will not say my attachment, but my deep reverence towards the Mother of Saints, when I am shewing it in action; yet that words may not be altogether wanting, I beg to lay before your Lordship the following extract from a

defence of the English Church, which I wrote against a Roman controversialist in the course of the last year.

"The Church is emphatically a living body, and there can be no greater proof of a particular communion being part of the Church, than the appearance in it of a continued and abiding energy, nor a more melancholy proof of its being a corpse than torpidity. We say an energy continued and abiding, for accident will cause the activity of a moment, and an external principle give the semblance of self-motion. On the other hand, even a living body may for a while be asleep. And here we have an illustration of what we just now urged about the varying cogency of the Notes of the Church according to times and circumstances. No one can deny that at times the Roman Church itself, restless as it is at most times, has been in a state of sleep or disease, so great as to resemble death; the words of Baronius, speaking of the tenth century, are well known: "Dormiebat tunc plane alto, ut apparet, sopore Christus in navi, cum hisce flantibus validis ventis, navis ipsa fluctibus operiretur. Una illa reliqua consolatio piis, quia etsi Dominus dormivit, in eadem tamen navi dormivit." It concerns then those who deny that we are the true Church, because we have not at present this special Note, intercommunion with other Christians, to shew cause why the Roman Church in the tenth century should be so accounted, with profligates, or rather the profligate mothers of profligate sons, for her supreme rulers. And still notwithstanding life *is* a note of the Church; she alone revives, even if she declines; heretical and schismatical bodies cannot keep life; they gradually become cold, stiff, and insensible. They may do some energetic work at first from excitement or remaining warmth, as the Arians converted the Goths, though even this seems, as the history shews us, to have been an accident, for which they can claim

no praise; or as the Nestorians spread in the East, from circumstances which need not here be noticed. But wait awhile, and 'see the end of these men.' 'I myself,' says the Psalmist, 'have seen the ungodly in great power, and flourishing like a green bay-tree. I went by, and lo, he was gone; I sought him, but his place could no where be found.' Heresies and schisms, whatever be their promise at first, and whatever be their struggles, yet gradually and surely tend not to be. Utter dissolution is the scope to which their principles are directed from the first, and towards which for the most part they steadily and continually move. Or, if the principle of destruction in them, be not so living as to hurry them forward in their career, then they remain inert and motionless, where they first are found, kept together in one by external circumstances, and going to pieces as soon as air is let in upon them. Now if there ever were a Church on whom the experiment has been tried, whether it had life in it or not, the English is that one. For three centuries it has endured all vicissitudes of fortune. It has endured in trouble and prosperity, under seduction and under oppression. It has been practised upon by theorists, browbeaten by sophists, intimidated by princes, betrayed by false sons, laid waste by tyranny, corrupted by wealth, torn by schism, and persecuted by fanaticism. Revolutions have come upon it sharply and suddenly, to and fro, hot and cold, as if to try what it was made of. It has been a sort of battle-field on which opposite principles have been tried. No opinion, however extreme any way, but may be found, as the Romanists are not slow to reproach us, among its Bishops and Divines. Yet what has been its career upon the whole? Which way has it been moving through three hundred years? Where does it find itself at the end? Lutherans have tended to Rationalism; Calvinists have become Socinians; but what has it become? As far as its Formularies are concerned, it may be said all along to have

grown towards a more perfect Catholicism than that with which it started at the time of its estrangement; every act, every crisis, which marks its course, has been upward. It never was in so miserable case as in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. At the end of Elizabeth's there was a conspicuous revival of the true doctrine. Advancements were made in the Canons of 1603. How much was done under Charles the First, need not be said; and done permanently, so as to remain to this day in spite of the storm which immediately arose, sweeping off the chief agents in the work, and for a time levelling the Church to the ground. More was done than even yet appears, as a philosophical writer has lately remarked, in the Convocation of 1661. One juncture there was of a later date (1688) which seemed to threaten a relapse; yet it was the only crisis in which no Ecclesiastical act took place. The temper, however, of the Church, certainly did go back; a secular and semi-sceptical spirit came in. Now then was the time when the Church lay open to injury; yet, by a wonderful providence, the Convocation being, during this period, suspended, there was no means of making permanent impressions on its character; and thus civil tyranny was its protection against itself. That very Convocation too expired in an act of zeal and faith. In our own times, temporal defences have been removed which the most strenuous political partisans of the Church considered essential to its well-being, and the loss of which they deplored as the first steps towards its ruin. To their surprise these well-intentioned men have beheld what they thought a mere establishment, dependent on man to create and destroy, rise up and walk with a life of its own, such as it had before they and their constitution came into being. How many learned Divines have we had, even our enemies being judges! and in proportion as they were learned, so on the whole have they approximated towards the full ancient truth. Or take again those whom by a natural instinct 'all the people count as Prophets,' and will

it not be found that either altogether or in those works which are most popular, those writers are ruled by primitive and Catholic principles? No man, for instance, was an abler writer in the last century than Warburton, or more famous in his day; yet the glare is over, and now Bishops Wilson and Horne, men of far inferior powers, but of Catholic temper and principles, fill the doctor's Chair in the eyes of the many. What a note of the Church is the mere production of a man like Butler, a pregnant fact much to be meditated on! and how strange it is, if it be as it seems to be, that the real influence of his work is only just now beginning! and who can prophecy in what it will end? Thus our Divines grow with centuries, expanding after their death in the minds of their readers into more and more exact Catholicism as years roll on. Nay even our errors and heterodoxies turn to good. Wesleyanism in itself tends to heresy, if it was not heretical in the outset; but so far as it has been in the Church, it has been overruled to rouse and stimulate us, when we were asleep. Moreover look at the internal state of the Church at this moment; much that is melancholy is there, strife, division, error. But still on the whole, enlarge on the evils as you will, there is *life* there, perceptible, visible life; rude indeed, undisciplined, perhaps self-willed, but life; and not the life of death, not that heretical restlessness, which, as we have observed, only runs out the quicker for its activity, and hastens to be no more, but, we may humbly trust, a heavenly principle after all, which is struggling towards development, and gives presage of truth and holiness to come. Look across the Atlantic to the daughter Churches of England in the States; shall one that is barren bear a child in her old age? yet 'the barren hath borne seven.' Schismatic branches put out their leaves at once in an expiring effort; our Church has waited three centuries, and then blossoms, like Aaron's rod, budding and blooming and yielding fruit, while the rest are dry. And

lastly look at the present position of the Church at home; there too we shall find a Note of the true city of God, the Holy Jerusalem. She is in warfare with the world as the Church Militant should be; she is rebuking the world, she is hated, she is pillaged by the world. And as if it were providentially intended to shew this resemblance between her and the sister branches, what place she has here, that they have there; the same enemies encompassing both them and her, and the same trials and exploits lying in prospect. She has a common cause with them, as far as they are faithful, if not a common speech and language; and is together with them in warfare, if not in peace.

"Much might be said on this subject. At all times, since Christianity came into the world, an open contest has been going on between religion and irreligion; and the true Church, of course, has ever been on the religious side. This then is a sure test in every age, *where* the Christian should stand. . . . Now applying this simple criterion to the public parties of this day, it is very plain that the English Church is at present on God's side, and therefore so far God's Church;—we are sorry to be obliged to add that there is as little doubt on which side English Romanism is. It must be a very galling thought to serious minds who profess it, to feel that they are standing with the enemies of God, cooperating with the haters of truth and haters of the light, and thereby prejudicing religious minds even against those verities which Rome continues to hold.

"As for the English Church, surely she has Notes enough, 'the signs of an Apostle in all patience, and signs and wonders and mighty deeds.' She has the Note of possession, the Note of freedom from party-titles; the Note of life, a tough life and a vigorous; she has ancient descent, unbroken continuance, agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church. Those of Bellarmine's Notes, which she certainly has not, are intercommunion with Christendom, the glory of miracles, and the prophetical

light, but the question is, whether she has not enough of divinity about her to satisfy her sister Churches on their own principles, that she is one body with them."

6. This may be sufficient to shew my feelings towards my Church, as far as statements on paper can shew them. I have already, however, referred to what is much more conclusive, a practical evidence of them; and I think I can shew your Lordship besides without difficulty that my present conduct is no solitary instance of such obedience, but that I have observed an habitual submission to things as they are, and have avoided in practice, as far as might be, any indulgence of private tastes and opinions, which left to myself perhaps I should have pursued.

And first, as regards my public teaching; though every one has his peculiarities, and I of course in the number, yet I do hope that it has not on the whole transgressed that liberty of opinion which is allowed on all hands to the Anglican Clergyman. Nay I might perhaps insist upon it, that in the general run of my Sermons, fainter and fewer traces will be found than might have been expected of those characteristics of doctrine, with which my name is commonly associated. I might without offence have introduced what is technically called High-Church doctrine in much greater fulness; since there are many who do not hold it to my own extent, or with my own eagerness, whose teaching is more prominently coloured by it. My Sermons have been far more practical than doctrinal; and this, from a dislike of introducing a character and tone of preaching very different from that which is

generally to be found. And I hope this circumstance may serve as my reply to an apprehension which has been felt, as if what I say in Tract 90 concerning a cast of opinions which is not irreconcileable with our Articles, involves an introduction of those opinions into the pulpit. Yet who will maintain, that what merely happens not to be forbidden or denied in the Articles, may at once be made the subject of teaching or observance? There is nothing concerning the Inspiration of Scripture in the Articles; yet would a Bishop allow a Clergyman openly to deny it in the pulpit? May the Scripture Miracles be explained away, because the Articles say nothing about them? Would your Lordship allow me to preach in favour of duelling, gaming, or simony? or to revile persons by name from the pulpit? or be grossly and violently political? Every one will surely appreciate the importance and sacredness of Pulpit instruction; and will allow, that though the holding certain opinions may be compatible with subscription to the Articles, the publishing and teaching them may be inconsistent with ecclesiastical station.

Those who frequent St. Mary's, know that the case is the same as regards the mode in which worship is conducted there. I have altered nothing I found established; when I have increased the number of the Services, and had to determine points connected with the manner of performing them for myself, if there was no danger of offending others, I have followed my own judgment, but not otherwise. I have left many things, which I

did not like, and which most other persons would have altered. And here, with your Lordship's leave, I will make allusion to one mistake concerning me which I believe has reached your Lordship's ears, and which I only care to explain to my Bishop. The explanation, I trust, will be an additional proof of my adherence to the principle of acquiescing in the state of things in which I find myself. It has been said, I believe, that in the Communion Service I am in the practice of mixing water with the wine, and that of course on a religious or ecclesiastical ground. This is not the case. We are in the custom at St. Mary's of celebrating the Holy Communion every Sunday, and most weeks early in the morning. When I began the early celebration, communicants represented to me that the wine was so strong as to distress them at that early hour. Accordingly I mixed it with water in the bottle. However, it became corrupt. On this I mixed it at the time. I speak honestly when I say that this has been my only motive. I have not mixed it when the Service has been in the middle of the day.

If I were not writing to my Bishop, I should feel much shame at writing so much about myself; but confession cannot be called egotism. Friend and stranger have from time to time asked for my cooperation in the attempt to gain additional power for the Church. I have been accustomed to answer that it was my duty to acquiesce in the state of things under which I found myself, and to serve God, if so be, in it. New precedents indeed, con-

firming or aggravating our present Ecclesiastical defects, I have ever desired to oppose; but as regards changes, persons to whom I defer very much, know that, rightly or wrongly, I have discountenanced, for instance, any movement tending to the repeal even of the Statutes of *Præmunire*, which has been frequently agitated, under the notion that such matters were not our business, and that we had better "remain in the calling wherein we were called." Of course I cannot be blind to the fact that "*time* is the great innovator;" and that the course of events may of itself put the Church in possession of greater liberty of action, as in time past it has abridged it. This would be the act of a higher power; and then I should think it a duty to act according to that new state in which the Church found itself. Knowledge and virtue certainly are power. When the Church's gifts were doubled, its influence would be multiplied a hundred fold; and influence tends to become constituted authority. This is the nature of things, which I do not attempt to oppose; but I have no wish at all to take part in any measures which aim at changes.

And in like manner I have set my face altogether against suggestions which zealous and warm-hearted persons sometimes have made of reviving the project of Archbishop Wake, for considering the differences between ourselves and the foreign Churches with a view to their adjustment. Our business is with ourselves—to make ourselves more holy, more self-denying, more primitive, more worthy our high calling. Let the Church of Rome

do the same, and it will come nearer to us, and will cease to be what we one and all mean, when we speak of Rome. To be anxious for a composition of differences, is to begin at the end. Did God visit us with large measures of His grace, and the Roman Catholics also, they would be drawn to us, and would acknowledge our Church as the Catholic Church in this country, and would give up whatever offended and grieved us in their doctrine and worship, and would unite themselves to us. This would be a true union; but political reconciliations are but outward and hollow, and fallacious. And till they renounce political efforts, and manifest in their public measures the light of holiness and truth, perpetual warfare is our only prospect. It was the prophetic announcement concerning the Elijah of the first Advent, that he should "turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers." This is the only change which promises good and is worth an effort.

What I have been saying as regards Roman Catholics, I trust I have kept steadily before me in ecclesiastical matters generally. While I have considered that we ought to be content with the outward circumstances in which Providence has placed us, I have tried to feel that the great business of one and all of us is, to endeavour to raise the moral tone of the Church. It is sanctity of heart and conduct which commends us to God. If we be holy, all will go well with us. External things are comparatively nothing; whatever be a

religious body's relations to the State—whatever its regimen—whatever its doctrines—whatever its worship—if it has but the life of holiness within it, this inward gift will, if I may so speak, take care of itself. It will turn all accidents into good, it will supply defects, and it will gain for itself from above what is wanting. I desire to look at this first, in all persons and all communities. Where Almighty God stirs the heart, there His other gifts follow in time; sanctity is the great Note of the Church. If the Established Church of Scotland has this Note, I will hope all good things of it; if the Roman Church in Ireland has it not, I can hope no good of it. And in like manner, in our own Church, I will unite with all persons as brethren, who have this Note, without any distinction of party. Persons who know me can testify that I have endeavoured to cooperate with those who did not agree with me, and that again and again I have been put aside by them, not put them aside. I have never concealed my own opinions, nor wished them to conceal theirs; but have found that I could bear them better than they me. And I have long insisted upon it, that the only way in which the members of our Church, so widely differing in opinion at this time, can be brought together in one, is by a "turning of heart" to one another. Argumentative efforts are most useful for this end under this sacred feeling; but till we try to love each other, and what is holy in each other, and wish to be all one, and mourn that we

are not so, and pray that we may be so, I do not see what good can come of argument.

7. Before concluding, there is one more subject on which I wish briefly to address your Lordship, though it is one which I have neither direct claim nor encouragement to introduce to your Lordship's notice. Yet our Colleges here being situated in your Lordship's diocese, it is natural for me to allude to the lately expressed opinion of the Heads of Houses upon the Tract which has given rise to this Letter. I shall only do so, however, for the purpose of assuring your Lordship of the great sorrow it gives me to have incurred their disapprobation, and of the anxiety I have felt for some time past from the apprehension that I was incurring it. I reverence their position in the country too highly to be indifferent to their good opinion. I never can be indifferent to the opinion of those who hold in their hands the education of the classes on which our national well-being, spiritual and temporal, depends; who preside over the foundations of "famous men" of old, whose "name liveth for evermore;" and from whom are from time to time selected the members of the sacred order to which your Lordship belongs. Considering my own peculiar position in the University, so much have these considerations pressed upon me for a long while, that, as various persons know, I seriously contemplated, some time since, the resignation of my Living, and was only kept from it by the advice of a friend to whom I felt I ought to submit myself. I say this, moreover, in explanation

of a Letter I lately addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, lest it should seem dictated either by a mere perception of what was becoming in my situation, or from some sudden softening of feeling under an unexpected event. It expressed my habitual deference to persons in station.

And now, my Lord, suffer me to thank your Lordship for your most abundant and extraordinary kindness towards me, in the midst of the exercise of your authority. I have nothing to be sorry for, except having made your Lordship anxious, and others whom I am bound to revere. I have nothing to be sorry for, but every thing to rejoice in and be thankful for. I have never taken pleasure in seeming to be able to move a party, and whatever influence I have had has been found not sought after. I have acted because others did not act, and have sacrificed a quiet which I prized. May God be with me in time to come, as He has been hitherto! and He will be, if I can but keep my hand clean and my heart pure. I think I can bear, or at least will try to bear, any personal humiliation, so that I am preserved from betraying sacred interests, which the Lord of grace and power has given into my charge.

I am, My dear Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful and affectionate Servant,

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

Oriel College,
March 29th, 1841.

OXFORD: PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

THE

SUBJECT OF TRACT XC.

EXAMINED,

IN CONNECTION WITH THE

HISTORY OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES,

AND THE

STATEMENTS OF CERTAIN ENGLISH DIVINES.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

THE CASE OF BISHOP MOUNTAGUE,

IN THE REIGN OF KING JAMES I.

BY THE

REV. FREDERICK OAKELEY, M.A.

FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD,

PREBENDARY OF LICHFIELD,

AND MINISTER OF MARGARET CHAPEL, ST. MARY-LE-BONE.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1841.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE original design, in this publication, was to make the Testimonies of the Divines its principal, and the remaining observations merely its subordinate feature. But the introductory remarks have grown, in the progress of the attempt, to a length, and some of the facts on which they are founded, appear to the writer to assume an importance, on which he did not originally reckon. He has accordingly altered the wording of the title page, while the sheets were passing through the press. This information is given to account for the prominence assigned to the Testimonies in the opening of the Inquiry; an inconvenience which could not have been obviated without the reconstruction of the whole.

THE

SUBJECT OF TRACT XC.

&c.

Among other objections which have been made to No. 90. of the Tracts for the Times, it is said to propound a view of the Thirty-nine Articles, which is unprecedented in the Church of England. The present collection of extracts is brought forward for the purpose of showing that such is not the case. One of two conclusions seems plain from them; either, that the divines from whose writings they are taken, had been at pains to reconcile certain opinions, which they both held and taught, with the terms of the Articles; or, at least, that they did not consider subscription to those Articles to present a bar to the promulgation of those opinions. And, since no view of subscription, however lax, goes the length of justifying persons in *teaching*, as well as *holding*, doctrines, which the Articles preclude, we are left to the inference, that, unless these divines regarded the Articles as a mere dead letter, they must

have been of opinion, that such doctrines were not precluded by them.

Nothing is as yet said of the case of Bishop Mountague, (appended to the extracts,) which amounts to far more than this; amounts, in fact, to something very like an *authoritative decision*, on the part of the then Church of England, *in favour* of the consistency of certain very close approximations to Roman doctrine, with the language of her formularies; such decision having been pronounced, after a careful deliberation, by a committee of Bishops, appointed by the king to represent the national Church.

For the present, however, I waive the case of Bishop Mountague, and confine myself to the extracts. And, in the first place, it is necessary to state, how much, and how much only, these citations are intended to prove. This necessity results from a prevailing tendency to mistake the nature of the proof to which what are called "Catenæ," and all testimonies of that description, are directed. Persons have sometimes appeared to think, that they could overthrow the evidence of "Catenæ" from the works of our divines, by producing counter "Catenæ" from the same sources; which would indeed be the case, were such evidence adduced to prove that the doctrines, which it accredits, are *true;* or, again, have been uniformly taught in our Church. But all that "Catenæ" *necessarily* show, and all that, as a matter of fact, they are generally intended to show, is, that certain doctrines are not *new*. This is said in anticipation of an

objection which may possibly be made to the proof now attempted. It may be called a "one-sided" view of the question. Persons may speak of the possibility of overwhelming such quotations as those now exhibited, with quotations, also from the works of English divines, of a directly opposite tenour.

Now such possibility is not merely admitted, but asserted. To what, however, does it amount? Plainly to no more than this; that the later Church of England (whether happily or not,) has ruled, or at least acquiesced in the presumption, that her Articles permit a very great latitude on both sides. It has never been maintained, that I know of, on the side of the Tract, assuredly not by its author himself, that all the doctrines, in behalf of which he pleads at least the *negative* testimony of the Thirty-nine Articles, are *imperative* upon the Clergy of the Established Church, *as such;* but simply that they are *compatible with honest subscription.* Now, this is distinctly denied on the other side. The doctrines in question, (at least in the extent intimated in the Tract,) are not merely, *in the judgment of the objectors*, excluded by the terms of the Articles, but have, it is farther urged, always been *considered, in the later English Church, to be so excluded by them.* This, then, and this only, is the point in question.

Again, it is not to the purpose to urge, as is sometimes done in objection to evidence like that now produced, that English divines are often inconsistent, not only with one another, but *with themselves;*

and thus that little, after all, is to be gathered from their statements on any one side. For the object, in these cases, is not to *justify the divines*, any more than to *ground* particular doctrines upon their *authority*, but merely to show what they have felt themselves at liberty to say, and been actually able to say without protest. And this fact has its own weight, whatever these divines may chance to have said elsewhere. Of course I do not here speak of reserves and qualifications made in the neighbourhood of the several passages.

Now it is by no means admitted of the present quotations, that they serve merely as *precedents*. Considering that they involve the judgment, upon certain subjects, of men like Andrewes and Thorndike, (not to speak of others) men not merely of profound learning, but of eminent piety, and known moderation, they must, with many persons, carry weight far beyond the very subordinate use now made of them. But there is no occasion to press them into our service beyond the point for which they are here claimed. It is enough that the authors of those passages are divines and bishops of our Church. And this being so, the question then is, not so much, who these divines and bishops were, as, what they maintained.

But there is yet another conceivable objection to the present line of defence, against which it is well to provide. It may be said, that, besides being unfair to our Church to represent her as a witness to doctrines so very much above the average pitch of

her theology, and so entirely at variance with her *occasional* teaching, it is also highly inexpedient, and especially at a time when many of her members are known to be tending in the direction of Rome, to select exclusively, and exhibit synoptically, the avowedly strongest statements which her annals any where supply, in favour of doctrines commonly thought to be characteristic of the Churches in the Roman obedience.

But this objection must be at once met by saying, that persons are driven upon this course in spite of themselves. It has been one result of the turn which the present controversy has taken, as observed by Mr. Ward, in a passage of his pamphlet quoted by Dr. Pusey [1], (a result, no doubt ordered for the best, however, with many, a subject of regret,) to provoke developments, or put upon modes of defence, which would otherwise have been premature, at least, if not positively objectionable. Mr. Newman speaks of having been deterred from certain explanations, in the first instance, by the fear of tempting persons "to go as far" as they legitimately might. And such, no doubt, is the tendency of the present argument, though framed with a view to quite a different object. All that can be said is, that, as things are, persons are exposed to a choice of difficulties. And, as we

[1] "Through the course which Mr. Newman has been obliged to take, the *Ora pro nobis* has been brought before persons who would otherwise have never thought of it."—A Few More Words, &c. page 84.

all know, the apprehension of possible results, though, (in the estimate of many) disastrous, must not deter us from a course manifestly right in itself. And such seems to be this course of obviating, if so be, great misapprehensions which are moving well-intentioned persons to adopt measures, and to use words, from which perhaps they would shrink, if they knew all, or bethought themselves, at the moment, of all they know. And in the responsibility of such (hypothetically) rash measures, and random words, any one would certainly in a degree be involved, who should, on whatever grounds of mere expediency, omit, where he feels himself able, to throw light on the subject. This, then, is one very plain Christian reason for the present publication; more shall presently be added. And, on the other hand, in stating, as has here been done, to how very little, after all, the present argument pretends, (the question being simply, whether that little be *enough* for the immediate purpose) it is hoped that all is done, which is possible under the circumstances, towards hindering persons from taking any undue advantage of it.

One inducement, then, to the present undertaking, is the earnest desire of promoting peace and unity, by throwing out for the consideration of persons, of whom the writer of these remarks is bound to speak with respect, and into whose difficulties he trusts he is not unable to enter, a view which may not have occurred to them, but which seems to make it at least

doubtful whether, by the course they feel it their duty to take, they be not fomenting needless divisions, and encouraging a spirit which, in its fullest developments (out of any man's power to arrest) they would be among the first to deprecate. Is it not that they are seeking to oppose, as at variance with the doctrine of the Church of which they are members, views, concerning which it is, at all events, a doubtful question, *whether they have not in past ages been assumed, or even pronounced, compatible with that doctrine;* and those, too, the very ages to which many of these persons are accustomed to appeal against the tone of teaching prevalent in our Church both at an earlier, and a later, period? and would it not seem that, in thwarting the present movement in favour of "more catholic views than satisfied the last century," they are rather siding with the Puritans of former times, than with the moderate party in the Church of England which they wish to represent? The case of Bishop Mountague is pertinent to this point. If the value of the evidence about to be produced be not greatly overrated, it would certainly tend to the conclusion, that, not they are introducing "a new era" in the Church of England, who endeavour to reconcile certain doctrines, however now, as of old, unpopular, with the language of the Articles, but rather they, who speak of subjecting to penalties, or placing under incapacities, the persons who are but claiming liberty to *hold* what English divines of former times claimed, and

were allowed, liberty to *teach*. This, rather than the other, would seem, if it may be said with all respect, to be the line of "innovation." No one questions the absolute right of the Church of this, as of any other day (properly represented), to impose new Articles, or a new sense upon her present; nor, again, the right and, what is more, the obligation, of individuals, whether in the University or elsewhere, to act for themselves, either in the matter of Testimonials, or in whatever other way, according to their conscientious notion of the words "doctrine and discipline of the Church of England." Only, inasmuch as the imposition of restrictions upon liberty of conscience, if it be not a duty, is certainly a sin, in that, (to omit other considerations) it is an injustice to individuals to set a mark upon them without reason, and an injustice to the Church, of which we are members, to deprive her of the services of Ministers who, not being (upon the hypothesis) disqualified for their functions, may, on other grounds, become instruments for the promotion of God's glory, and the edification of their brethren; it should certainly be a grave question with any one, who may feel inclined to debar, as far as he is able, certain persons from ecclesiastical or quasi-ecclesiastical privileges, whether he may not be laying up for himself materials of future repentance, while believing himself, in his heart, to be "doing God service[2]."

[2] To avoid all possibility of misapprehension, I will say that I am not here disputing the prerogative of Heads of Colleges to

But it is not merely that we are bound in duty to the Church of Christ to do what we can towards healing her "unhappy divisions," and to individuals, (not to deprecate, on our own account, the exercise of a power which may affect ourselves, for this is a mere trifle, or rather such temporary hardship as may be the result of it, is likely to be a benefit to ourselves, but) out of very tenderness towards our brethren, to press on them the duty, as well as the immense importance at this critical juncture, of calm religious reflection. We are likewise under especial obligation to our Bishops, to aid them (as, in a measure, the humblest has the power) in the course of moderation and forbearance which they have hitherto maintained, amid many temptations to deviate from it, under the excitement of this anxious controversy. It becomes us, where we think we have the means, to strengthen, if it may be said, their hands, by putting before a party which is endeavouring, by clamour, to provoke them to some authoritative interference, the adequate vindication (may it not rather be said the true grounds?) of their past and continued forbearance. For, who can doubt, that

order all matters connected with *education* in their respective Societies, according to their own view of the interests of those entrusted to their care. I refer only to cases in which the "doctrine of the Church of England" is directly in question. And both the general tone of conversation in Oxford, and the tenor of recent publications, are enough to protect me, in what has now been said, from the charge of harbouring merely ideal apprehensions.

the pointed avoidance of all allusion to *doctrine*, in the only instance in which any of our Prelates has hitherto felt it necessary to interpose publicly, in consequence of the Tract, as well as the great reluctance manifested by the Bishops generally to interpose at all, have arisen from a disinclination, on their parts, even to appear to *rule*, (at least without very great caution,) that a certain construction of a Formulary, so avowedly comprehensive as the Thirty-nine Articles, is *absolutely inconsistent* with the obligations imposed by subscription; and thus to run risk of a schism in our Church, the effects of which it is impossible to calculate?

Again, it is a plain duty of justice and charity towards individuals, lying under grievous imputations on the score of unscrupulousness, if not positive dishonesty, to show what can be shown in their defence; and this, quite irrespectively of any claims which they may have upon this or that person on more private grounds; though, of course, the tie of affection, or the sense of obligation for services felt to be inestimable, will increase, in particular cases, the desire of coming forward, at all hazards, and with how little soever hope of success, in their behalf. In a public document, the production of grave and experienced persons, holding high and responsible situations in the country, and almost proverbial for caution, the view of the Tract has been pronounced, not merely dangerous (which is a mere expression of opinion upon *it*), but "evasive," which involves also a

very serious reflection upon its author. Under these circumstances, it seems but common justice to the writer of the Tract, to show, if it can be shown, that he has done no more than others have done, without reproach, before him; or rather that, with great candour, and at the risk of much odium, he has gone out of his way to adjust with the terms of the Articles, statements which our older divines seem rather to have *advanced without scruple;* thus challenging investigations which they felt themselves strong enough to defy, and providing against objections, which they would not even imagine. Many, probably, who cannot bring themselves to think the author of the Tract *right*, would be equally, or even more, unwilling, to think some of our older divines *wrong*, which, in such measure as his statements are borne out by their authority, is the virtual effect of condemning him. And, after all, even if this farther consequence be not feared, or lamented, still, (as has been already said,) the plea of precedent would be thus made good on the side of the Tract.

In the way of introduction to the following extracts, I will observe, that the result of recent enquiries into our ecclesiastical annals of the three last centuries, has been to convince me, that the later Church of England has been, from first to last, remarkably unwilling to protest, *as a Church*, against the doctrines of Rome. Her authoritative protests, when she has thought it right to make

them, have been directed, almost, if not quite, without exception, against a far different school of theology. This remark appears to me to apply even to the period of the Reformation itself; when, if at any time, the Church of England might have been expected to declare herself strongly and unambiguously on the Protestant side. And, of course, there are very many who consider that she has so declared herself in the Thirty-nine Articles. But if this fact be not certain from the language of the Articles themselves, (and that it is not certain seems to be admitted at least by those who resort to the private opinions of the Reformers to determine the question,) certain it is, that history gives *no countenance whatever* to the opinion that, the Articles were drawn up *with the view of excluding Catholics.*

With respect to the original Articles of 1552, it seems doubtful, whether they were ever enforced; if at all, it was but in few instances [3]. After the revision of 1562, they *were* enforced; but, as it appears, against *Non-Conformists*, and not Roman Catholics. The question with Rome was then, as in after times, regarded in a merely political point of view.

"*Against Papists* (says Fuller, who certainly cannot be suspected of any 'Romanistic' bias,) it was exacted that, to write, print, &c. *that the Queen was a*

[3] "He (Cranmer) laboured to have the clergy subscribe them; but against their will he compelled none." Strype's Cranmer, p. 272. Cf. Bp. Short's Hist. of the Church of England, § 484.

heretic, &c., should be adjudged *treason*. *Against Non-Conformists*, it was provided that every Priest or Minister should, before the Nativity of Christ next following, declare his assent, and subscribe, to all the Articles of Religion agreed on in the Convocation of 1562, under pain of deprivation [4]."

And accordingly it appears, that Roman Catholics continued in the communion, and even in the Ministry, of the Church of England, for several years after the first promulgation of the Articles.

"Hitherto" (*i. e.* till A.D. 1570), "Papists generally without regret repaired to the places of divine service, and were present at our prayers, sermons, and *Sacraments* . . . . . In which sense, one may say, that *the whole land was of one language and one speech*. . . . . Hitherto the English Papists *slept in a whole skin, and so might have continued*, had they not wilfully torn it themselves [5]."

It farther appears, that many members of the Lower House of Convocation, who were Roman Catholics, subscribed the Articles upon the revision in 1562 [6].

[4] Fuller, p. 98. Eliz.

[5] Fuller, p. 98. Eliz. See also Strype's Grindal, p. 98. "Of the subscribers (to Queen Eliz. injunctions for conformity), ... there were many, who had said Mass in Queen Mary's time, and such as would not change their custom of old Pater Noster." Vide Short's Hist. of the Church of England, § 437.

[6] Strype, (Ann. of Ref. c. xxviii.) gives their names; and, among them, we find that of the celebrated John Bridgwater, (called in Latin, Aquapontanus) who, in 1582, published the Treatise called

The term "Recusant," by which the Roman Catholics of this country were formerly designated, at once denotes the ground, and fixes the date, of their separation from the national Church. It was not *upon the promulgation of the Articles*, nor upon any other measure of the Church of England, but upon the *political regulations* which arose out of the formal excommunication of Elizabeth, in 1569, that Roman Catholics withdrew from the communion of our Church. Before that time, not even the Oath of Supremacy was a bar, as a general rule, to their admission even to *civil*, far less to ecclesiastical, privileges; the majority of them understanding this oath as a mere test of loyalty[7].

But as to the Articles, never, that I can find, were they urged, or felt, as a ground of disunion between the Churches; and this fact, as I must consider it, is

"Concertatio Ecclesiæ Catholicæ in Angliâ adversus Calvino-Papistas et Puritanos," being an account of the sufferings of English Roman Catholics in the time of Elizabeth.

[7] See a Tract called the "Execution of Justice in England," (1583.) "These *seditious acts* . . . have made them traitors . . . *not their books*, nor their words, no, nor their cakes of wax which they call Agnus Dei," &c. (p. 45.)

Again, the Jesuits, addressing Queen Elizabeth, said, "In the beginning of thy kingdom thou didst deal something more gently with Catholics: none were then urged by thee, or pressed either to thy sect, or to the denial of their faith." Again, "none were ever vexed *that way*, *simply for that he was either Priest or Catholic*, but because they were suspected (of disloyalty)."—Important Considerations written by the Secular Priests against the Jesuits, 1601.

farther attested by the statement so commonly made, that Rome *withdrew herself*, and not *was driven*, from our communion; and again by the plea, upon which the penal enactments, carried out from time to time in this country against Roman Catholics, have always been defended; viz. that they were enforced upon merely civil, and in no wise upon religious, grounds. And if the "unscrupulousness of Roman Catholics" in respect of oaths, and other similar obligations, be urged as the ground of the insufficiency of our formularies as means of excluding them, then it must be shown, *why they were eventually excluded*. For that they did refuse *some* tests, is undeniable.

But to return to the Articles. There would seem to have been reasons, both of necessity and of policy, which would be likely to influence the English Reformers in favour of a very great latitude of expression upon subjects which other Protestants, or they, under other circumstances, might have been apt to determine with far greater precision.

It is much to be considered, in the first place, that, with the English Reformers, Protestantism was, as I may say, an *after-thought*. The English Reformation, upon whatever theological grounds it may eventually have been based, was, undoubtedly, in the first instance, a mere political movement; being (so far) unfavourably distinguished from the continental struggle, which, though it ultimately issued in excesses from which we have been providentially kept, was, in its origin, far more than the English

Reformation, of the nature of an *indignant protest against existing corruptions* [9]. I do not at all deny that corruptions of a like crying enormity, though perhaps of a different kind, existed in this country also. All I say is, that, not the scandal of these corruptions, but the influence of the Pope, and especially as it pressed inconveniently upon Henry, was the *gravamen*, to which, in this country, the quarrel with Rome owes its origin. This, of course, is not stated as a discovery, but merely adduced as an evidence to the point in hand. But the question with the See of Rome being thus opened, (no otherwise upon ecclesiastical, than as they were subservient to political, grounds,) it rapidly assumed a theological shape; and the English divines of the time were forced upon the necessity of treating, and, what is far harder, of legislating, on various and abstruse points of doctrine, under all the disadvantages of persons who had been educated in the system they were now obliged to oppose, and been rather led by circumstances, than moved by any spontaneous impulse, to adopt that, into which they were suddenly required to throw themselves.

Now this consideration, I cannot but think, will account, in a great measure, for the inconsistencies which are to be found in the writings of the English

[9] This unfavourable feature of our Reformation was observed by the foreigners; Ἦλθε δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ξένος τις, πεμφθεὶς ἐκ τῆς Βρετανίας, μόνον διαλεγόμενος περὶ τοῦ δευτέρου γάμου τοῦ βασιλέως· τῶν δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων, οὐ μέλει, ὡς

Reformers, as well as for the (presumed) indecisive character of the Formulary which we owe to them. How was it possible, that men, of whatever ability, who had no thoughts, but for external and accidental occurrences, of originating formal declarations on the subject of Catholic doctrine, should come to the task with that maturity of reflection, and extent of foresight, which are absolutely necessary, (except where the want of long previous preparation is supplied in some degree by strong single-hearted earnestness,) to the statement of precise and definite views of theology? The divines of our own country took up Protestantism in details and by degrees, not like Luther and Calvin, as a comprehensive system [1]. We find, accordingly, that, when pressed to declare themselves formally upon the great doctrinal questions which agitated Europe at the time, they "beat about," if I may use the expression, for assistance in more experienced quarters [2]. Now, the idea thus thrown out, if it do

φησι, τῷ βασιλεῖ.—Melanchthon, quoted in Cardwell's Preface to the Two Books of Edward VI.

The Greek Church, of the present day, is said to sympathize more with the Foreign Protestant communities, than with the Church of England, from esteeming the Foreign a more *conscientious* act than the English Reformation.

[1] Hence the doctrinal incongruities discoverable in the works, for instance, of Cranmer, who was chiefly concerned in drawing up the Articles.

[2] "The communication with those eminent men" (the foreign Reformers) "which had been opened, in the first instance, at the desire, and for the private purposes, of Henry, and had been dis-

not seem improbable, would precisely explain their adoption in the Formulary which they actually put out, of *terms rather than definitions*, and *vague definitions rather than those more precise;* and, again, for their practice (observed by Mr. Newman) of combating *popular views*, rather than *authoritative statements*, of doctrine, and protesting against *apparent practices*, rather than embarrassing themselves with minute theological distinctions. This is just the course of persons who do not feel themselves "at home" in a subject, as I suppose it is no injustice to the English Reformers to say that they could not have

continued, from a mutual feeling of distrust, during the latter portion of his reign, was resumed, at the death of that prince, and carried to the greatest possible extent. Hooper, Horne, Cox, Traheron, and others, who became conspicuous in the history of the English Church, were frequent correspondents, and some of them intimate friends, of Bullinger and the Reformers of Zurich. Bucer wrote a gratulatory letter to the Church of England in praise of its homilies, and with the view of recommending farther alterations; Calvin dedicated a part of his Commentary to the Protector Somerset, and urged him to carry on the *great work in which he was engaged; Cranmer repeated his earnest invitations to Melanchthon*, Hardenburg, and other distinguished Reformers, and *John à Lasco*, &c. &c. were received in England in the most favourable manner, and many of them placed in situations of trust and influence." Dr. Cardwell's Preface to Two Prayer Books of Edward VI. p. ix.

Dr. Short shows (Hist. of Ch. of Eng. § 483) how much assistance the English reformers derived in the Articles from foreign sources; and he vindicates them (§ 343) on the ground of the difficulty of their task.

been, in the great controversies of their time. They neither came to their work, like the divines of Trent, as persons who had been long familiar with the system they were required to develope and secure; nor, again, like the framers of the German or Swiss Confessions, with that almost intuitive perception of their subject, which is well known to be the result of deep interest in any matter, and which is no inadequate substitute for long study and laborious research. The contrast, in point of precision, between the earlier and later among the Thirty-nine Articles, which Mr. Ward has observed in the "Appendix" to his Pamphlet, is a confirmation of the view now suggested.

But another consideration, quite sufficient to explain the very remarkable difference, in respect of *stringency*, between the Thirty-nine Articles and Continental Formularies, on whichever side, is that of the peculiar circumstances, under which the Articles were constructed. The divines of Trent, or, again, of Switzerland, drew up their several Confessions of Faith with the freedom and fearlessness of persons who knew that the Churches and countries which they represented, were "with them[3]." The

[3] Compare, for instance, sweeping statements, like the following in the Helvetic Confession, with the declarations of the Thirty-nine Articles:—"Cæteras (præter Eucharistiam) cæremoniarum ambages inutiles ac innumerabiles, vasa, vestes, vela, faces, aras, aurum, argentum, quatenus pervertendæ religioni serviunt, idola præsertim .... ac id genus omnia profana, a sacro nostro cœtu procul arcemus." Again:

English Reformers, on the contrary, were hampered in their work by the most conflicting and embarrassing influences. They were kept, willing or unwilling, in the orbit of neutrality by the effect of opposite forces. On the one hand, there were the foreign Protestants, clamouring for a sanction, on the part of the "first of Reformed Churches," of their extreme proceedings [4]. On the other, there were the known sentiments of the English nation, any thing but ripe for a radical change of religion, if not the prospect of difficulties in Convocation, many members of which were in favour of the old system; and the consequent necessity of not making the Articles unacceptable to those to whom they were to be submitted [5].

Again: "Proinde cœlibatum, ritum monasticum, et totum hoc ignavum vitæ genus, superstitiosorum hominum abominabile commentum, procul rejicimus, æquè et Ecclesiæ, et reipublicæ, repugnans."

[4] The English Reformers applied for help to Melanchthon, as the most moderate of the continental Protestants, and so the fittest to aid them in their difficult work. But, for this very reason, the ultra party abroad kept him back; "quod *mollitiem* animi ejus suspectam haberent." See Dr. Cardwell's Preface to the Two Books of Edward VI. p. v.

[5] Strange indeed is it, that history should make it doubtful whether the Forty-two Articles were ever submitted to Convocation *at all*, considering the title which they originally bore. If they were not, their profession misrepresents them in a way which involves something more than disingenuousness in the parties concerned in promulgating them. Yet the respected author of the History of the Church of England thus writes, and substantiates his observation by reference to documents of the time. "From the

Mr. Ward [6] appears to have stated this point somewhat drily and technically, when he imputes (as I understand him,) to the English Reformers, a deliberate and disingenuous purpose, *throughout their task*, (for in places they can hardly be screened from the imputation,) of adjusting the claims of these rival

title under which the Articles were originally published *, it might be supposed that they derived their authority from the sanction of Convocation; but if they were ever submitted to the Upper House, which is very questionable, it is *indubitable* that they were never brought before the Lower; while *all the original mandates which remain, prove that they were promulgated by Royal authority* alone." Short's History of the Church of England, § 48.

Heylin (Hist. of the Reformation, p. 126, A. D. 1552,) considers this supposition too monstrous to be entertained, and accordingly supposes that Convocation delegated its power to a Committee, (nominated, according to Dr. Short, by *the king.)* He argues, rather strangely, that the profession of the title is justified by his view, as though a Committee of one House of Convocation were equivalent to the whole body of the two. The whole story, like all else connected with the annals of the English Reformation, is, to say the least, very uncomfortable.

But whether or not Cranmer drew up the Articles for the Convocation, (if so, the proof to the present point is so much the stronger; and even the fact, if true, that he did not ultimately submit them, does not show that he had no intention of submitting them to one or both Houses,) still it is certain that he both designed, and attempted, to obtain the subscription of the Clergy (Strype's Cranmer, p. 27) which would alone oblige the course of moderation.

[6] A Few More Words, &c. p. 43.

---

* Articuli de quibus in *Synodo Londinensi*, &c.

parties, the foreign Protestants on the one side, and the old English Catholics on the other. Mr. Ward seems to think, that they set out, and acted all along, with the intention of reconciling, as a kind of mathematical problem, the maximum of Protestantism with the minimum of offence. It is not, perhaps, necessary to go this length; and if it be not necessary, one is bound, in charity, to stop short of it. That the English Reformers were anxious to give many of the Articles as Protestant an air, as they thought it prudent to risk, this I cannot but apprehend. And yet it may be questioned whether, *on the whole*, they acted with any direct and systematic disingenuousness; and not rather in some such way as the framer of a petition to Parliament (for instance) who wishes to make a striking manifesto of opinion, without losing more signatures than he can help; or, again, as a somewhat too compromising preacher, who, under the influence of anticipated objections, puts saving, (which are, in fact, neutralizing,) clauses into his sermon. Of course such proceedings are quite inconsistent with strong, earnest, and distinctly realized, views; but these it is, I will say, quite certain, that Archbishop Cranmer, for one, did not possess either way; at least when he drew up the Articles. That he did not possess them, is sufficiently shown by the fact of his writings being cited on completely different sides of a theological controversy.

It may seem unfair to the Reformers to represent

their course in respect of the Articles under any other character than that of a wise and commendable moderation. But it is to be considered, whether many of the points which they have left indeterminate, be not points, if not of necessary faith, at least of necessary deduction from the ground-work of all faith, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, upon which we thankfully acknowledge that the Articles *are* unambiguous. I may mention the subject of the "Holy Catholic Church," as one among many others, upon which a precise Formulary would not merely *allow* of the orthodox, but *preclude* the erroneous, view. There are points of Catholic belief, only not condemned in the Articles (such *e. g.* as the Eucharistic Sacrifice,) the *denial* of which, if it appear strong to call it actual heresy, is, at least, of a directly heretical tendency; and want of explicitness on these, if intentional, implies unworthy compromise; if unintentional, culpable short-sightedness. It must not be complimented with the name of moderation. It is moderation only when its subject matter is unessential; but the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism are so fundamental and irreconcileable, that, if the Articles (as I have all along supposed,) give free scope for near approximations to the extremes *on both sides*, they *must* involve the compatibility with honest subscription, of what, in the judgment of one, or the other party, is serious error. This consequence of the present argument may as well be frankly acknowledged at once, since it cannot

be avoided. But then it must be borne in mind, that our Clergy (as Mr. Ward reminds us) not merely subscribe the Articles, but declare their assent to the Prayer-book, which must, accordingly, be regarded as our Church's standard commentary upon several of those points which the Articles have left in doubt [7]. But, on what may be called the Protestant side of the question, there is no corresponding interpreter of the Articles. The Homilies tell as much one way as the other; which cannot certainly be said of the Prayer-book.

To pass now from the composition of the Articles in 1552, to their revision and republication in 1562. If it be highly probable, both on *à priori*, and on historical, grounds, that their original framers drew them up with a studied reference to the views of those who retained their prepossessions in favour of the old Religion, this fact appears to be historically certain, in the case of Archbishop Parker, and the divines who remodelled them. Of these Dr. Heylin says,

"Their moderation is no less visible in declining all *unnecessary determinations*, which rather tended to the multiplying of controversies, and engendering of strifes. . . . So that they seem to have proceeded by those very rules which *King James* so much approved of in the Conference at Hampton Court. First, in not separating farther from the Church of

[7] See "A Few More Words," &c. by the Rev. W. G. Ward, p. 21.

Rome, than that Church had separated from what she was in her purest times; 2dly, *in not stuffing the Articles with conclusions theological*, in which a latitude of judgment was to be allowed, as far as was consistent with peace and charity. As they omitted many whole Articles in King Edward's book, and qualified the expressions in some others, so were they generally very sparing of anything which was merely matter of modality, or *de modo* only. . . . *which rules being carefully observed by all the bishops, it was no wonder that they passed their votes without contradiction.*

"But in taking the subscription of the Lower House, there appeared more difficulty. For, though they all testified their consent unto them, yet, when subscription was required, *many of the Calvinian or Zuinglian Gospellers, possibly* [8] some also which were inclined rather to the *old Religion*, and who found themselves unsatisfied in some particulars, had demurred to it [9]." He adds, that at length *all subscribed.* This appears doubtful [10]; however, very many, at all events, subscribed, including Roman Catholics.

From all this it would appear, that the object, both of the original framers, and subsequent revisers,

[8] This is remarkable. He speaks as if the objections had come rather from the other quarter. The passage is likewise important, as intimating that the Catholics (for it is a fact (vid. sup. p. 13) that many were in the Convocation,) *demurred* to the terms of the Articles; did not, I mean, regard them as a mere *unmeaning declaration of conformity;* yet they eventually yielded.

[9] Hist. of Ref. Eliz. p. 159.

[10] Strype, A. of R. c. xxviii.

of the Articles, was to form a National Church upon the most comprehensive basis; consisting of all who could by any means be brought to subscribe its characteristic Formulary. Had they wished to exclude Roman Catholics, as persons holding views dangerous to the National Church, it is quite inconceivable why they should present (as they did,) the Articles, again and again, to the members of Convocation, (many of whom had offices in the Church in the preceding reign,) until all, or nearly all, had subscribed them. Had their purpose in the Articles been what the modern view supposes; as soon as any Roman Catholic refused to sign, it would have been answered. They had framed their test, and it was successful. What then remained, but that the objectors should quit the Ministry? Instead of which, they took the best means in their power to overcome the scruple[1]. This certainly looks as if our divines did not try, like Luther and Calvin, to create a new Protestant community; but sought rather to remodel the existing, and long-established, English Church. And, though it be true, that they made a grievous mistake in admitting into it the elements (as proved by subsequent events,) of certain disunion, still, on the other hand, they seem to have acted in a Catholic spirit towards the representatives of the ancient Faith; not seeking to dispossess them of their place in the Church, provided only they were content to remain in it as *English*, not as *Roman*, Catholics; to give up their adhe-

[1] See Heylin, p. 159.

sion to the Pope, *so far as it was inconsistent with the claims of the National Head*, retaining, the while, their belief in other points of the common Catholic Faith[2]. And so matters remained for several years; and so they might have continued, but for later events, which brought on a crisis: and though, in themselves, (like the original differences with Rome under Henry VIII.,) of a political, rather than a religious, nature, produced an immediate, and most material, change in the visible relations of the Churches.

It does not fall within the scope of these observations, to pursue, what may be called the history of the Catholic doctrine in the later Church of England, beyond the period of the Reformation, as finally settled under Elizabeth. It is hereafter to be shown, that this view of the Articles, which it has been attempted to establish on historical grounds, and by which they are presumed to be (except where they refer to the direct subject of the Creeds,) a mere declaration against certain existing abuses, couched, occasionally, in highly Protestant language, but, in truth, clear of the doctrines which they appear to infringe, is, if not the very view, at least not materially unlike the view, upon which certain of our divines must be thought to have proceeded. For otherwise, we must accuse these divines of running wilfully counter to the doctrine of

[2] The Roman Catholics, of former times, who took the Oath of Supremacy, appear to have understood it, according to the interpretation proposed in Dr. Pusey's pamphlet on Tract 90, as a mere disclaimer of the Pope's *temporal* authority in this kingdom.

their Church, or that Church of most deplorable remissness, in not vindicating her own doctrine; of remissness, indeed, to which she could not have yielded, without knowing for certain, that she was thereby precluding future generations from all hope of recovering, (at least without a second Reformation,) that (supposed) anti-catholic sense of the Articles, which she was thus suffering to escape.

But, before coming to this latter point, I may add, that the study of our later ecclesiastical annals will also furnish many indications of a like providential care exercised in the preservation of our Church from a committal, by any formal act, to uncatholic error.

The one exception to the truth of this remark, which, after some attention, I have been able to discover (if indeed it be, as for my own part I am certainly disposed to think that it is, an exception) is in what are called the Canons of Archbishop Laud, because ratified by a synod of the Church of England in his primacy. This, to the best of my knowledge and belief, is the only document of the nature of an ecclesiastical decision, (and the observation may be extended to *political* enactments, between the periods of the Reformation and Revolution of 1688 [2],) which condemns any *doctrine* of Rome, as distinct from the Papal claim of *jurisdiction* in this realm[3]. In the Canons of 1603, there is no hint of apprehension from

[2] See Appendix.

[3] Such acts as that of the Seven Bishops, in 1688, not being acts of the Church of England, but of individuals, do not interfere with the above statement.

the influence of foreign Churches, except in the single injunction for the presentment of "*Recusants*" to the ordinary, to be by him reported to the Bishop, and so on to the king. Again, the synodical acts of our Church in 1604 and 1661, were both of them in a more Catholic direction than the proceedings at the time of the Reformation [4]. The case of Bishop Mountague involves a strong declaration on the Catholic side. On the other hand, the State of England, till the Revolution, did not attempt to meddle with the doctrinal profession of Roman Catholics, provided only it could obtain a guarantee for their *loyalty* [5].

[4] The re-introduction of the explanation at the end of the Communion Service, made on the latter of these occasions, may, at first sight, appear to be at variance with this remark; as it is, indeed, the only other instance I have observed of Roman doctrine being even *glanced at* by our Church during the abovementioned interval. On consideration, however, it will be found even to support the view now taken; as the substitution of the term "*corporal* presence" for "*real* presence" was plainly an act "in a more catholic direction," and seems to fall in with the general habit of our Church, by condemning, not formal statements of doctrine, but popular corruptions*. Our assent to the Prayer-book of course involves no judgment as to the advisableness of this commentary upon our Service. Mr. Newman, however, has contended, in his Tract, that it may be understood in a sense altogether innocent.

[5] The following are important testimonies, on both sides, to this fact. The first is from the work of a Protestant, (supposed to be Bishop Barlow,) published shortly before the Revolution. "It

* Cf. Dr. Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences, &c., p. 35. Note. (See Appendix.)

And it is remarkable that the time which the State chose for an innovation upon her ancient policy in this respect, should have been the beginning of an epoch, during which, more than at any other period since the Reformation, the Church of England was disposed to act independently of the State. And a memorable fact it is, that the expiring energies of Convocation were directed, not against any high Mystery of the common Faith, under the name of superstition, but, contrariwise,

" It is certain that these oaths" (of Supremacy and Allegiance) " were primarily designed to be a sufficient test to distinguish Papists from others. And yet in either of them there is no mention of *doctrine*, but only those which concern government, that is, the external government both of Church and State. . . . I may add the constant profession and answer of all Protestant writers. Whensoever any complaint has been made of the severity used to Roman Catholics, it has been always said that they suffered not for religion, but for treason, &c."—" Considerations on the true way of suppressing Popery," p. 35. See also pp. 47. 53. 73. 115.

On the other hand, the Secular Priests urged against the Jesuits in 1601 :—

" If we at home, all of us, both Priests and people had possessed our souls in meekness and humility, honoured her Majesty, borne with the infirmities of the State, suffered all things, *and dealt as true Catholic Priests* . . . assuredly the State would have loved us, or, at least, borne with us: where there is one Catholic, there would have been ten . . . *for none were ever vexed that way simply*, for that he was either Priest, or Catholic, but because they were suspected . . . of traitorous designments."—" Important Considerations," in a Collection of Tracts on the Penal Laws. London, 1675.

against the heresy, which passes through a degradation of the Sacraments into a dishonouring of Him who is their Life [6].

But the Canons of 1640 present, as I may be allowed to say of an act of the then Church, in no way binding upon us, a somewhat perplexing combination of Catholic regulations, of an external kind, with strong disclaimers of the doctrine, which alone gives to such usages, as are therein enjoined, any value, or even any meaning. It would be a curious question, which this is not the place to pursue, whether much of the odium which our Church has, at different times incurred, on the ground of *formalism*, may not have been, in great measure, due to the want of a clearer recognition, on the part of her divines, of the intimate connexion subsisting between the forms and the spirit of true Religion; or, in other words, a fuller development of the Sacramental theory of the Church. Certainly, I would not be thought to defend the conduct of the Puritans; and yet, without referring more to one age than another, it seems both due to others, and salutary for ourselves, to consider, whether the opposition which our Church has, at different times, encountered from serious, although mistaken, persons, may not have arisen, in some degree, from a tendency, on the part of her members, to substitute mere outward conformity for vital unity, and to lay stress upon externals, without a clear enuncia-

[6] Bishop Hoadly has been declared, on high authority, a Socinian.

tion of the principles upon which they depend[7]. But, to return to the Laudian Canons. I will not avail myself of the argument *ad hominem*, by which this document might be disposed of, on the ground of its alleged want of authority. These Canons, though not, I believe, an act of Convocation, were certainly the act of a synod. I admit also, that, as far as they go, they appear to me to be at variance with the moderation of tone characteristic of the later Church of England. I am glad, for the sake of our Church, that she has renounced them. I am glad, for the sake of Christian unity, that, in subscribing the Articles, we are not required to declare assent to these, or any other, Canons. It is well known, that a Bishop of our Church suffered himself to be put under arrest rather than subscribe them. But Bishop Goodman, it is urged by many, was a Roman Catholic; and so, they would say, his objection to the Laudian Canons, is not to the point. Now if, when it is said that Bishop Goodman was a Roman Catholic, it be meant, that he formally joined the communion of Rome, this certainly was not the case. If he were a Roman Catholic in any other sense, then may such a Roman Catholic

[7] And, surely, considering the very imperfect and ambiguous development of Catholic principles *generally*, even in the very best days of the Church of England since the Reformation, (not to speak of the painfully unecclesiastical character of proceedings in that æra itself,) we seem bound, in justice as well as charity, to make the largest allowance for those, who, in these latter days, have failed to recognize, in our Church, their appointed Mother in the Faith.

be in the communion, and even in the highest office, of the Church of England; which is very much to the present point. The higher we set Bishop Goodman's Catholicism, the more striking is the fact, that one who was conscientious enough to suffer penalties rather than subscribe the Laudian Canons, *should not have stumbled at the Articles*. How strange a phenomenon in the history of any Church, or, rather, (may we not say?) how wonderful a token of the Providence which has watched over ours, that catholic minds, perplexed by the inconsistencies of a catholic age, should be able to fall back upon the *Articles*, "the offspring of an uncatholic" one; and, again, that Protestants of a later time should have been the parties to extricate Catholics from obligations of which they are glad to be relieved, and even to contend for the Formulary, by which they are willing to be tried!

Whether it have arisen from the unwarrantable conduct of the Roman party in England, or from the recollection of ancient grievances, or from the desire of obviating, at any rate, the suspicion of Popery, or from an inadequate estimate of the importance of Catholic unity, or from whatever other cause; certain it is, that some even of our greater divines are accustomed to speak of the Roman Church in terms which it is hard to reconcile with their very close approximation, in parts of their writings, to Roman doctrine. And one reason, perhaps, why persons are startled by attempts, such as that inci-

dentally made in Tract 90, to harmonize parts of the Articles with the Decrees of Trent, is, that they derive their idea of our Church's position in respect of other branches of the Church Catholic, from the harsh and exclusive tone upon which many of her divines have been forced by circumstances, rather than from the actual amount of their testimony to Catholic Truth. It has not been unusual with us to speak almost as if *independence* were, *per se*, a greater boon to a Church, than oneness with the Catholic body; a sentiment, which appears to savour rather of Judaism, than of the gracious and comprehensive dispensation under which we live. With the intimations of our own Church, at least, (not to mention the explicit declarations of Scripture,) it would seem most agreeable, to consider that the especial work of the Holy Spirit in the Body Catholic is to make the "whole earth," which the author of confusion has split into parts, "of one language, and of one speech[3]."

But the stronger has been the temptation, whether arising out of our national peculiarities, or the pressure of external circumstances, to glory in our isolation, as a Church, instead of mourning for the sins of which it is the penalty; the deeper should be our gratitude to those of our divines, who, with Andrewes in England, and Forbes in Scotland, have made the

[3] First Lesson for the morning of the Monday in Whitsun week.

restoration and re-union of Christendom, the object of their efforts, and of their prayers.

It may not be uninteresting, nor altogether irrelevant to the object of the present publication, to give some account of two remarkable attempts, (among others,) which have been made in different ages, and (as there is reason to suppose,) on different sides, of the Church, in this country, of a character somewhat similar to the Essay which has lately attracted so much notice and censure. The more recent of these very curious and striking dissertations it falls immediately within my present object to notice. The other is well worthy of the attentive consideration of English Churchmen, as the testimony of an impartial witness to the orthodoxy and catholicity of our own communion. I begin with the latter.

"Francis à Sancta Clara, a Dominican friar, of great learning and moderation, whose real name is Christopher Davenport, was chaplain to Queen Henrietta" (to whose influence we are indebted for one of the most catholic books in our Church, the "Hours of Devotion," of Bishop Cosin,) "and afterwards to Catharine, Queen of Charles II. He was much noticed by the learned men of his day[4]. This ecclesiastic entertained the idea of the possibility of reconciling the Churches of England and Rome;

[4] He appears to have lived on terms of familiarity with Laud and Goodman.

and, with this view, had composed a short Treatise, in which he endeavoured to show that the Articles of the Church of England were in accordance with the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, supporting his position from the writings of Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Montague, Dr. White, and other learned Protestants[1]."

The Treatise to which the above extract refers is called "Expositio Doctrinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ," and is appended to a work on the subject of the Calvinistic controversy[2]. Although written with a somewhat different object from Tract 90, it will be found to suggest an interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, in many respects strikingly similar to that put forward by Mr. Newman. As this fact has been publicly urged in objection to the Tract, I will at once admit the accuracy of the statement. This exposition speaks in the strongest language of the general catholicity of the English Articles. The great majority, including those on "Predestination," "on Ministering in the Congregation," and "on Baptism," be characterises in terms such as the following:—"Omnino catholicus," "optimam continet doctrinam," "quadraginta 88. Scripturis, doctrinæ sanctorum Pa-

[1] Bayne's Preface to "the Court of King James I. by Dr. Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester."

[2] The title of the work is "Pietas, Virtus, Unitas, sive Tractatus de Predestinatione, &c. Autore Francisco a Sancta Clara," &c., published in 1674.

Speaking abstractedly, (that is to say, viewing the matter as a question of *divine right*,) Councils *may* be gathered together *without* the interference of Princes, as Jerome would not have denied. But *per accidens*, (that is to say, taking into account the circumstances of time, place, &c.) the consent, and even the command, of Princes is a preliminary requisite.

"Again" (he continues) "the words which follow, present no greater difficulty. 'Things pertaining to God,' is an expression of great latitude. That General Councils may err in things *not necessary to salvation* (quæ fidem aut mores ad salutem necessarios non concernunt) is the common judgment of our doctors . . . . . Let none, then, quarrel with this clause "even in things," &c. That General Councils can err in things *necessary to salvation*, the Article does not assert. That they may err in minor matters, Catholics do not deny.

"The last words of the Article express the judgment of the Church in modern, as well as ancient, times. For Councils cannot *make* a proposition heretical, which before was otherwise; neither can they *coin* (cudere) an Article of Faith. Their province is, to give an *explicit* force to the *implicit* sense of Scripture and the Apostolic words, (ex abditioribus SS. locis et Apostolorum dictis, veritatem eruere) that so (as Lirinensis has it) a later generation may more clearly understand what a former more indistinctly believed . . . . . This is all the Church proposes, when she is said to determine (definire) certain truths. For she rests (innititur) not on any fresh revelations, but on those of the ancient time, which are *involved* (latitantibus) in the Scriptures, and words of the Apostles," &c.

The view which this acute and learned divine takes of Art. XXII. is as follows:

Art. "The Romish doctrine concerning . . . . . the Invocation of Saints is a fond thing," &c.

"Words," (proceeds the expositor) "doubtless of a very severe aspect. But observe; what the terms of this Article condemn, is not Invocation of Saints *simply in itself*, (as is evident,) but the *Romish doctrine of Invocation*. . . . . .

"What then is this Romish doctrine? or rather, what is the Protestant account of the Roman doctrine? . . . . . For the question is, not what the so-called 'Romanists,' have said, but what Protestants have supposed them to say. Calvin (Inst. l. iii. c. 20) affirms, that we invoke the Saints as gods. Andrewes, in his answer to Cardinal Perron, supposes that our prayers are directed to the Saints as ultimate objects of worship, and without any qualification (ultimatas et absolutas) and, as it were, to so many divinities. And this he tries to show from the *harmony*, not of our doctors, but of our hymns (concentu, non consensu).

"On the whole, then, the Anglican Confession determines nothing against the Catholic Faith, but rather condemns a profane and heathen doctrine, with which the Church is not fairly chargeable."

Here this commentator has certainly overlooked important considerations connected with the subject, to which Mr. Newman has drawn attention; especially the value of our Article as a protest against actual abuses, and as a warning against "*peril* of idolatry." So far, however, as this interpretation considers that "not every doctrine, but only the *Romish* doctrine," of Invocation, is condemned by the Article, it agrees with that of the Tract. The question, upon which Mr. Newman and Sancta Clara appear to differ, is

that of the extent to which the Church, in whose communion certain abuses exist, is committed, by *non-interference*, to the *virtual* sanction of what she formally disavows.

This Roman Catholic interpreter takes the same view with Mr. Newman, of expressions in our Articles, which, denying of certain practices or institutions, that they are *Scriptural*, in the sense of being *ordained in Scripture*, do not deny, that they may be, and are, obligatory, as matters of ecclesiastical regulation. Speaking of Art. XXVIII., towards the close of which are the words "by *Christ's ordinance*," he observes,

"What is not by CHRIST formally commanded, may yet by the Church be rightly instituted."

Again, with reference to Art. XXXII.

"Bishops, priests, and deacons, are not *commanded* to vow celibacy; they are not required, *jure divino*, to abstain from marriage; therefore, as far as 'divine right' is concerned, they *may* marry, both lawfully and validly. This is the more common opinion in the schools, and the Article makes no farther assertion."

The important connexion between the two parts of Art. XXXI. "on the One Oblation," is clearly pointed out in this commentary.

Art. "The Offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world . . . *wherefore* the *sacrifices* of *masses*," &c.

Obs. "The former part, so far as it relates to the affirmative proposition, is no subject of controversy. And, where the Article proceeds to a denial of all satisfaction for the guilt of sin, the Oblation of the Cross excepted; we must understand that the whole of that which is affirmed of CHRIST, is denied to any other; in other words, that none, except CHRIST, can, by any action or suffering, wash away sin, that is, to the exclusion of CHRIST," (præscindendo CHRISTUM).

Hence he concludes, that the Article does not contravene the doctrine of those English divines, who consider that the Eucharistic Ordinance involves a true, although a commemorative Sacrifice.

The other work, to which I have referred, as bearing upon the subject of Mr. Newman's Tract, is called "An Essay towards Catholic Communion, by a Minister of the Church of England." It was published in 1715; and, being avowedly an attempt towards reconciliation with Rome, attracted, as was natural at that particular time, the notice of the government. A warrant appears to have been issued from the Secretary of State's office for the seizure of the author's papers, and the arrest of his person; under a suspicion, apparently, that he was in league with the Pretender. It was more than insinuated by adverse parties, that he was actually in communion with Rome at the time; but the internal evidence of his book, is, in the opinion of competent and most impartial judges whom I have consulted, so

strongly the other way, that I am bound, in honesty, as well as charity, to give him credit for his professions.

The object of this writer is to show, by quotations from the works of approved divines of the Church of England, especially Bishops Andrewes, Forbes, and Mountague, the coincidence between the statements of our own theologians, and the authoritative declarations of the Council of Trent, upon various points of doctrine and practice; as, for instance, the Real Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Intermediate State, Intercession for the Dead, and the Reverence due to Images and Relics. Accordingly, this Essay is alone enough to take from the present undertaking all pretension to originality. However, my object, so far, falls short of that of this writer, that, while he seems to consider that the Church of England *teaches* certain doctrines, all at which I aim, is to show, that she cannot be *proved to repudiate them.* And of this Essay, ingenious and (on the whole,) conclusive as it is, I am ready to admit, that it seems to me, for the reason I have just given, partial, if not disingenuous. Also, I will add, that, in the extracts which the writer has made from the works of English theologians, (the most important of which, I have verified, and find correct,) he has not always been sufficiently observant of *collateral* qualifications in the context of what he cites. Altogether then, I will say of this very curious book, that, while no person ought to take any decisive step in the present controversy, till he has carefully

read, and fairly weighed it; I am, for my own part, inclined to dispense with the evidence which it furnishes to the point of these observations, from feeling, not so much, I may sincerely say, that it is questionable, as that it is superfluous.

The extract, which, among others, I am about to make in support of the statement to the proof of which these observations are directed, shall come from a quarter which there can be no difficulty in admitting. It shall come, not from this Catholic Essay, but from the Anglican Reply to it. Of this, then, I will now say a few words. The Essay, in question, is accompanied by Observations intended (according to the profession of the title-page,) to "detect the mystery, and to expose and defeat the design, of the original work." The writer of these Observations evidently supposed, that the author of the Essay was a Roman Catholic in disguise, and, accordingly, does not spare him. He, then, at least, must be considered an impartial witness. Yet we shall presently see, how far even *he* goes on the side of the Tract.

The "Observations" in question I have been enabled to trace to Nathaniel Spinckes, A. M., Rector of Peakirk cum Glynton, in the county of Northampton, and diocese of Peterborough and of St. Martin, Sarum, and also Prebendary of that Cathedral; of which dignity he was deprived, in the episcopate of Bishop Burnet, A.D. 1690, on the ground of his refusal to take the oaths to King William III.

Of the remaining divines, by whose writings I

have profited in the present attempt, there is but one of whom I feel it necessary to say any thing in this place.

William Forbes, D.D., flourished in the times of James I. and Charles I., and was appointed first Bishop of Edinburgh in the reign of the latter. He was a native of Aberdeen, and entered the Marischal College in that city at the age of twelve. After completing his academical career, he visited the continent of Europe, and studied, for some time, in the German universities. He was deeply versed in the theology of the early Church, and accurately acquainted with the original languages of Holy Scripture, especially Hebrew. It is needless to add, that he was master of Latin. Upon his return to Scotland, he entered the sacred Ministry, and laboured in his calling with extraordinary zeal. King James I. being at Aberdeen, Forbes was chosen, with others, to confer with that monarch on matters of academical privilege; and received the degree of D.D., by royal mandate. He was afterwards, successively, Principal of the College, and Rector of the University. On the visit of King Charles I. to Scotland in 1633, Forbes was nominated to fill the See of Edinburgh, endowed by that monarch. Immediately after his consecration, he was attacked by serious illness, which ended mortally in the third month of his episcopate, and forty-ninth year of his age.

His principal work, to which I am now indebted,

is entitled "Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ Controversiarum," and is avowedly an attempt to effect a reconciliation with Rome, on the basis of the common Catholic Faith. It was found among his papers, and published after his decease. The following is the testimony of an intimate acquaintance to the usefulness and excellence of his Ministerial life.

"Inter alios eminebat Gulielmus Forbesius ex opere quodam posthumo, *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ Controversiarum, &c.* inscripto, erudito orbi cognitus, inter primos sui ævi eruditos.—Vir, vitæ sanctimoniâ, humilitate cordis, gravitate, modestiâ, temperantiâ, orationis et jejunii frequentiâ, bonorum operum praxi, industriâ pauperum curâ, clinicorum crebrâ visitatione et consolatione, et omnifariâ virtute Christianâ, inter optimos primitivæ Ecclesiæ Patres annumerandus. In concionando ad populum fervens adeo ut auditorum mentes et affectus raperet; doctrinâ et eruditione insignis, sublimato pollens judicio, memoriâ etiam tenacissimâ (de quo vulgo dictum, quod ignoraret quid sit oblivisci), Veritatis et pacis amantissimus, ac proinde, rerum controversarum momentis acutissime expensis et pensitatis, nulli parti addictus, partium lites componere, saltem mitigare, satagebat." Geo. Garden in vitâ R. V. Joh. Forbesii, p. 19. inter Forbesii opera, vol. 1.

Having now, as I hope, sufficiently cleared the way for the following extracts, I will add a few concluding words in explanation.

If, in the preceding remarks, there be any expression which seems even so much as to imply

the desire of reflecting upon past transactions, or needlessly reviving exhausted discussions; if any, which can be thought to betoken a defective appreciation of the difficulties of others, or an intention of throwing obstacles in the way of their conscientious discharge of duty, I heartily lament such expression, and wish it recalled.

Much, surely, there is, both in the actual appearances of the Church at this time, and in the position and circumstances of those who, in their endeavours to defend her, have drawn upon themselves the opposition of zealous men, to create mutual sympathy, even where, unhappily, there can be but little agreement. It is impossible any longer to shut our eyes, even where we may wish it, to the fact, that certain views of theology have gained an influence in this country, which may well alarm those who think them essentially wrong, and must needs make all anxious, but those who think them essentially right. So far as any person sees in these views, not a mere fortuitous collection of opinions, some true, others false, others indifferent; but a compact, harmonious, and living system, which, if it be not divine (as its upholders maintain) must be the antagonist of what is divine, I cannot but admire that person's sagacity, however I may deplore his conclusion. There is neither wisdom, nor fairness, in denying that a certain course of teaching *does* tend to what the parties who make the assertion mean by "Popery," that is, to the *full* and *consistent* carrying out of the Sacra-

mental theology; the doctrine, namely, that *the Church Catholic, as the Instrument of the Holy Spirit, and the Representative of our Lord in His Kingly, Priestly, and Prophetical Offices, is the one (ordained) channel of blessing from God to man, and means of access from man to God.* And, no doubt also, so far as the impressive and consolatory idea of a Visible Church is more fully realized in Rome, than among ourselves, the craving, which this course of instruction has been chiefly instrumental in awakening, *tends* even to Rome; which, however, is very different from saying, or necessarily implying, either that it *ought* to *terminate* there, or that it *will.* But if by "Popery" be meant, some form of superstition and idolatry, then not they only, who seek to *advance*, but they also, who do not *actively resist*, the present movement, (being supposed conscientious men,) must be understood to intimate, by the very fact of such advocacy, or acquiescence, their belief that it tends to no such result, except in the way of perversion or abuse.

Again, on the other hand, although the defenders of the Tract imply, by the very circumstance of defending it, that they consider the difficulties greater on the side of those who oppose its interpretation of the Articles, than on their own, yet few of them, I imagine, go so far as to say, that their own side is altogether without difficulty. Mr. Newman, for one, has never intimated that he regards the construction for which he pleads, as the *obvious* one; quite the

reverse. Now the confession of *primâ facie* difficulty on the one side, is a virtual admission of the claim to sympathy and forbearance on the other. At all events, I will express my own firm persuasion, that in points such as those upon which the present controversy has chiefly turned, there is no side in the Church of England, at this moment, the representatives of which are, under existing circumstances, in any situation to dogmatize or condemn. It is one thing to feel, that there is no safety but in the consistent following out of one line of doctrine, to the exclusion of all others; and, again, that our Church, fairly considered, presents no insurmountable barrier to the pursuit of Truth, even in its remoter bearings, in that direction; and quite another, to deal hardly with those, be they without, or within, the pale of the Church established, who, whether from the prejudices of education, or the prevalence of traditionary impressions, coinciding with the absence of any unambiguous witness on the other side, on the part of our Church herself, are bent on carrying out, with greater or less consistency, the principles which it has all along been assumed that the English Reformers themselves were not unwilling to encourage.

So little, happily, does sympathy, in the present instance, depend on perfect agreement in opinion, that, rather, where there is the less agreement, there is, for some reasons, the greater sympathy. It is easier, I mean, to *understand*, and, so far, to feel with, those who, looking at the present movement in its

true character, as part of a consistent whole, regard it as simply evil, than with those who view it with mixed feelings, or with no feelings at all. Wherein such persons esteem it a deep philosophy, and not a mere interesting literature; an absorbing principle, and not a mere transient excitement; and wherein they look below its superficial appearances, into its solid grounds, and beyond its present manifestations, to its undeveloped capabilities, they take, as I must think, a truer and more earnest view of the subject, than those who pronounce a hesitating and qualified sentence upon certain parties and proceedings; much more than those who seek to talk the matter off, as a mere ephemeral topic, or hush it up, as a mere inconvenient disturbance. On the other hand, and in the way of compensation, it must be remembered, that where there seems less of consistency and reality to command our admiration, there is also less of what we must consider serious error to excite our sorrow. And again, when it is said that we may not *understand* how this or that person is able to reconcile certain opinions, or courses, which seem to *us* contradictory, still this is very different from charging him with culpable inconsistency. Which of us is any judge of another, or can attempt to try his mind by any known rule? It is most certain, indeed, that truth and falsehood, and, therefore, consistency and inconsistency, have a nature of their own, independent of the mind to which they are accidentally subjected; but, important as it is to recol-

lect this, for the purposes of faith, it is, for the purposes of charity, equally important to consider, that, as respects the *moral probation of individuals*, this essential nature admits of incalculable modification from unknown varieties of circumstance. At all events, so it is, that, among the opponents of the doctrine in question, the vast majority are, if I may not say happily inconsistent, at least happily unprepared, to oppose it without reluctance or reserve. Few, comparatively, are ready to say of the Catholic movement, that it is simply evil, and so to throw themselves, heart and soul, into the antagonist system. And those, who are not so disposed, but who, I really believe, were they required to make their choice, would at once close with *mere* Catholicism rather than *mere* Protestantism, I ask, with every distrust of myself, but none of my cause, to try and realize their position, and their objects; what they dread, and what they believe; and why so believing, they so dread; and what, above all, it is, that they mean to build upon the ruins of what they seek to cast down; and what is the amount of their agreement with those whom they join for a present purpose; and how, except there be indeed some vital bond of union among them, they can hope to replace a doctrine which is *certainly* real, certainly influential, certainly productive of the fruits of holiness, charity, self-denial, and all that *seems* like the religion of the Gospel, by any thing equally real, equally influential equally (may I say it without offence?) *evangelical?*

Let it be considered, that the great religious system which, for a long time, bore, and, so far as it comprehended portions (as surely it did) of essential truth, *deserved*, that sacred name; which, in what it contained of high and holy, was, no doubt, God's instrument for awakening us to a sense of our responsibilities, and of infusing life and warmth, where before, it may be feared, was too often the mere cold profession of orthodoxy; let it be considered that this system, once to all appearance so compact, and beyond question so popular and attractive, is now, as a system, manifestly breaking to pieces. What of it is earthly, is finding its level. What of it is earnest, self-denying, and affectionate, is uniting itself with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, which alone, in its completeness, (such as I am far from saying has yet been realized amongst ourselves, and which, when realized, will draw to its side whatever of good amongst us is now kept back by the want of such due developement,) provides an adequate scope, and a reverential direction, for the feelings of devotedness and brotherly love.

Considerations such as these do not, of course, hold good upon the supposition that the Church of England is unambiguous in her witness against the theology in question, and imposes upon her members a clear obligation to withstand it. But to those, who are doubtful upon this point, they may fitly be suggested, in the way, not of an adequate motive, but of a restraining scruple; and not as reasons of

mere expediency, but rather as providential intimations, which, though they cannot avail to overthrow a settled, and fully realized, conclusion, may well create a presumption against an ill-defined view, or come in arrest of a headlong judgment, or remove (which is rather their bearing upon the subject of these remarks) a preliminary obstacle to the examination of the proper evidence.

I will only add, that the following extracts by no means pretend to be more than *specimens* of the teaching of English divines upon the points in question. And, again, that, while taking to myself the undivided responsibility of the present publication, I desire to express my sincere thanks to the Rev. J. S. Brewer, of King's College, for the assistance I have received from him in collecting materials; and to my much-esteemed coadjutor in the ministrations of Margaret Chapel, the Rev. W. U. Richards, for the advantages I have derived through his official connexion with the British Museum.

London,
July 8, 1841.

It being quite beyond the scope of the present undertaking to bear out the interpretation of the Tract upon any other subjects, than those in which it has been most generally questioned, the following extracts will be found to refer chiefly to the doctrines brought forward in the Protest of the Four Tutors, and most frequently dwelt upon in the progress of the controversy, by opponents of the Tract.

I.

THE EUCHARIST A COMMEMORATIVE SACRIFICE FOR QUICK AND DEAD.

Bishop Andrewes. Answer to XVIIIth chapter of Card. Perron.

"The Eucharist ever was, and by us is considered, both as a Sacrament, and as a Sacrifice. 2. A Sacrifice is proper and appliable only to divine worship. 3. The Sacrifice of Christ's death did succeed to the sacrifices of the Old Testament. 4. The Sacrifice of Christ's death is available for present, absent, living, dead, (yea, for them that are yet unborn). 5. When we say the dead, we mean, it is available for the Apostles, Martyrs, and Confessors, and all, (because we are all members of one Body): these no man will deny.

"In a word, we hold with Saint Augustine in the very same chapter which the Cardinal citeth, 'quod hujus Sacrificii caro et sanguis, ante adventum Christi, per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in Passione Christi, per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adventum Christi, per Sacramentum memoriæ celebratur[1].'"

Farther on:

"If we agree about the matter of Sacrifice, there will be no difference about the Altar. The holy Eucharist being considered as a Sacrifice, (in the representation of the breaking the Bread, and pouring forth the Cup,) the same is fitly called an Altar: which again is as fitly called a Table, the Eucharist being considered as a Sacrament, which is nothing else, but a distribution and an application of the Sacrifice to the several receivers. The same Saint Augustine, that, in the place alleged, doth term it an Altar, saith in another place, 'Christus quotidie pascit. Mensa ipsius est illa in medio constituta. Quid causæ est, ô audientes, ut mensam videatis, et ad epulas non accedatis[2]?' The same Nyssen, in the place cited, with one breath calleth it θυσιαστήριον, that is, an Altar; and ἱερὰ τράπεζα, that is, the Holy Table.

"Which is agreeable also to the Scriptures. For, the altar in the Old Testament, is, by Malachi, called 'mensa Domini[3].' And of the Table in the New Testament, by the Apostle it is said, 'habemus Altare[4].' Which, of what matter it be, whether of stone, as Nyssen[5]; or of wood, as Optatus, it skills not. So that the matter of Altars makes no difference in the face of our Church[6]."

[1] Aug. de Civitate, lib. 17. c. 20.

[2] Hom. 46, de Verbis Domini secundum Joannem.

[3] Mal. i. 7. [4] Heb. xiii. [5] Nyssen. de Bapt.

[5] For additional testimonies of English divines on this subject, see Tracts for the Times, No. 81.

Again, ibid. ix.

"For offering and prayer for the dead, there is little to be said against it. It cannot be denied, that it is ancient."

Thorndike. Just Weights and Measures, pp. 106, 107.

"But the practice of the Church in interceding for them (the Dead) at the celebration of the Eucharist, is so general, and so ancient, that it cannot be thought to have come in upon imposture; but that the same aspersion will seem to take hold of the common Christianity."

Then, after saying (so far with Mr. Newman) that such practice does not imply the "Romish doctrine of Purgatory," he proceeds:—

"In the meantime, then, what hinders them to receive *comfort* and *refreshment*, *rest* and *peace*, and *light*, (by the visitation of God, by the consolation of His Spirit, by His good Angels), to sustain them in the expectation of their trial, and the anxieties they are to pass through, during the time of it? And though there be hope for those that are most solicitous to live and die good Christians, that they are in no such suspense, but within the bounds of the heavenly Jerusalem; yet, because their condition is *uncertain*, and where there is *hope of the better*, *there is fear of the worse*; therefore the Church hath always *assisted them with the prayers of the living* both for their *speedy trial*, (which all blessed souls desire), and for their easy absolution and discharge with glory before God, together with the accomplishment of their happiness in the receiving of their bodies. Now all members of the Church Triumphant in heaven, according tothe degree of their favour with God, abound also with love to his Church Militant on earth. And though they know not the necessities of particular persons, without

particular revelation from God; yet they know there are such necessities, so long as the Church is militant on earth. Therefore it is certain, both that they offer continual prayers to God for their necessities, and that their prayers must needs be of great force and effect with God, for the assistance of the Church Militant in this warfare. Which if it be true, the Communion of Saints will necessarily require that all who remain solicitous of their trial, be assisted by the prayers of the living, for present comfort and future rest."

Bishop Forbes. (*Considerationes Modestæ, &c.* p. 460. *et seq.* ed. 12mo. 1658.)

"Missam non tantum esse Sacrificium Eucharisticum et honorarium, sed etiam propitiatorium, sano sensu dici posse, recte affirmant Romanenses moderatiores; non quidem ut *efficiens* propitiationem, et remissionem peccatorum *(quod Sacrificio Crucis proprium est)* sed ut eam jam factam *impetrans* quomodo oratio, cujus hoc Sacrificium species est, propitiatoria dici potest."

Again, (p. 463.)

"Sacrificium autem hoc Cœnæ non solum propitiatorium esse, ac pro peccatorum quæ a nobis quotidie committuntur, remissione, offerri posse modo prædicto Corpus Dominicum, sed etiam esse impetratorium, omnis generis beneficiorum, ac pro iis etiam rite offerri, *licet Scripturæ diserte et expresse* non dicant, Patres tamen unanimi consensu Scripturas sic intellexerunt, quemodmodum ab aliis fuse demonstratum est, et Liturgiæ omnes veteres, non semel inter offerendum, orandum præcipiunt pro pace, pro copia fructuum, et pro aliis id genus temporalibus beneficiis, ut nemini ignotum est."

Also, (p. 465.)

"Quod toties hoc cap. Sacrificium quod in Cœna peragi-

tur, non tantum Eucharisticum esse, sed etiam sano sensu propitiatorium, et plurimis *non solum viventibus, sed etiam defunctis*, prodesse, quomodo scilicet oratio, cujus hoc Sacrificium species est, propitiatoria, &c. dici potest, confirmat Bellarm. ipse de Missa, l. ii. c. 5. Sacrificium, inquit, simile est orationi, quod attinet ad efficientiam; oratio enim non solum prodest oranti, sed etiam iis, pro quibus oratur. Unde manducatio Eucharistiæ quæ fit a Sacerdote, ut est Sacramenti susceptio, soli sumenti prodest, ut autem est Sacrificii consummatio, prodest illis omnibus, pro quibus oblatum est Sacrificium."

Again, (*ib.* p. 267.)

"Mos orandi et offerendi pro defunctis antiquissimus et in universa Christi Ecclesia ab ipsis ferme Apostolorum temporibus receptissimus, ne amplius a Protestantibus ut illicitus, vel saltem ut inutilis, rejiciatur," &c.

And (on the especial subject of Prayers for the Dead.);

Spinckes. Observations on Essay towards Catholic Communion, p. 103.

"Having already written and published a 'Discourse of Prayers for the Dead' . . . and I think sufficiently proved the practice and tradition thereof in the Church, truly Catholic, I shall here only add to what I before and this author here have written, that, besides the authors mentioned already, the learned and devout Bishop Andrewes was of the same opinion, as appears by his 'Private Devotions,' printed at the Theatre at Oxford, in Greek and Latin, licensed by Dr. Bathurst, Vice-chancellor, 1673, and commended in the Epistle to the reader as having in it no heresy or dangerous opinion, but that he may safely read it all, and repeat it as his own a thousand times before God. Wherein besides what may be observed elsewhere, he prays

in this manner, 'Thou who art Lord, both of the living and of the dead . . . . . Give to the living mercy and grace, and to *the dead rest and light perpetual* [6].'

"To censure prayers for the dead, because not expressly enjoined in the Scriptures, is inconsistent with the doctrine of the Scriptures themselves (2 Thess. ii. 15. 1 Cor. vii. 17, &c.) and with reason, because the Christian religion being planted in all places by word, order, and practice, and *no where by writing*, and planted by so many several persons, in so many several places, and *all agreeing in the use of it in the most solemn part of the Christian worship from the beginning, and so unanimously, that I never yet could meet with any competent evidence of any one Church which ever received it after their first foundation, or from any other than their founders. So that it stands upon equal evidence with the Scriptures themselves.*"

II.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

Bishop Mountague. Invocation of Saints, p. 58.

"It is true, and must not be denied, the Roman Church in her *doctrine* (for, and concerning *practice*, it is other-

[6] These, it need hardly be observed, are the words of the Breviary, "Requiem æternam dona eis, Domine, et Lux perpetua illuceat eis."

The following prayer for departed benefactors, in whose kind offices we constantly participate, (from the "Benediction of the Board" in the Roman Breviary, where its meaning is illustrated by the context,) is still kept up in one of our Colleges :—

"Retribuere dignare, Domine, omnibus, nobis bona facientibus, propter Nomen Tuum vitam æternam."

wise) doth not impair, or impeach the sure, firm, and fastest mediation, the peculiar work of Christ Jesus, or appoint propitiators in his place, who alone, as Allsufficient, paid the price of our redemption, and made up without assistants or concurrents, the alone, absolute Atonement, by His real and perfect Satisfaction, betwixt God and man. . . . . It is false which is imputed, if yet it be imputed, and laid unto their charges, *that they have many gods, or many lords.* That they call upon Saints, as upon God, to help them. That they mention not Christ, but Saints, in their devotions. They do not deny *Call upon me.* In their doctrine and opinion, Invocation is peculiar unto God alone, as a part of the eternal moral duty which man ever doth owe unto God, his Maker and Protector in all his ways. Invocation, I mean, in a proper sense; it is Advocation and Intercession only which they give unto Saints; *which act is sometimes called Invocation in a large extent*, as it passeth, and is directed, from man to them. Their help, with David, only standeth in the Name of the Lord, who hath made both heaven and earth.

"For better evidence in this point, the question controversed *inter partes*, may be limited, or rather explained, thus.—Invocation, as was touched, is a word of ambiguous signification; as most words are, because there are more things than words, subsistances than names to call them by. It is taken specially for to *call upon Me*, as Him upon whom we absolutely rely: at least *ultimate*[7] in that kind. It is also used for to *call unto*, as to helps, assistants, or advocates in suit, when in time of trouble and necessity we have cause to come and call on God, directing our prayers ever *prima intentione* unto Him. When, therefore, we talk of Invocation of Saints, and dispute concerning Praying

[7] Cf. Sancta Clara, ut sup. p. 39.

unto Saints, we must understand Invocation so, as directed unto them only, as assistants, and mediators only of intercession; and therefore not to be invocated, or called upon, *in the same sense and terms* as God Almighty is, the Author and Donor of every good giving: nor to be implored as Christ Jesus is, the only Mediator of redemption and Meritorious Advocate of intercession. Therefore, having occasion and cause to *call Me in time of trouble*, they employ not *te ad me*, man unto God, immediately, but do it *secundario*, and *by mediators*. This is not unlawful in itself.

Bishop Forbes, (ut supra, p. 299, 230*)*.

" Nudam angelorum et sanctorum compellationem qua moneantur et invitentur, ut nobiscum, et pro nobis, Deum orent, (quomodo a piis hic viventibus petimus, ut pro nobis apud Deum intercedant, suas preces nostris conjungant, iisdemque nostram salutem sedulo commendent,) cum Protestantibus iis, qui paulo cautius et distinctius aliis in hoc argumento loqui amant, Advocationem potius quam Invocationem [a *calling unto*, rather than a *calling upon*[8],] appellamus. . . . Advocationem appellare malunt R. Montacutus, [vid. sup.] J. Usserius, Arch. Armach. cont. Jesuit., ut alios omittam. Alioqui, in *significatione vocis lata*, nihil vetat Invocationem appellari."

Again (quoting Bishop Montague), p. 327.

" R. Montacutus respondens ad factum Justinæ Virginis a Nazianzeno (orat. in Cyprianum) memoratum, 'Si illi (Rom. sc.) hoc facerent ipsimet, et proselytos . . . . . docerent facere quod fecit virgo hæc, ad Deum scilicet, et Christum primo confugere, et deinceps ex abundanti sive ad-

[8] His own words.

juverit, sive non adjuverit, in auxilium vocare B. V. Mariam, S. Petrum, &c. εἴ τις αἴσθησις, ut loquitur Naz. &c. non contenderemus. In Eccl. Rom. praxi res longe aliter se habet[1].'"

III.

REVERENCE DUE TO IMAGES AND RELICS.

Bishop Mountague.

"PINGITE, sequemur. Sculpite, suspicimus; Abrahami sacrificaturientis imaginem, Christi in Cruce pendentis Passionem, typum, illum, hoc, complementum. Quis negat?

[1] The following words in the Morning Prayer of Bishop Andrewes border very closely upon Invocations to Angels and Saints *for aid, and spiritual strength.*

Angelum pacis, fidum ducem,
Custodem animarum et corporum
Castrametantem in circuitu meo
Et mihi salutaria semper *suggerentem*,
Concede, Domine.

To this may be added Bishop Ken's prayer (quoted in the 2nd edition of Tract 90), that the guardian angel may

"His love angelical *instil.*"

But too much stress ought not to be laid upon the words of metrical Hymns *on either side.*

To go to quite a different subject, what Roman Catholic would express himself more strongly than the judicious and popular George Herbert on the subject of the Real Presence?

"At Communion times the Priest is in great confusion, as being *not only to receive* GOD, *but to break and administer* HIM."—Country Parson, C. xxii.

nos imitamur in Ecclesiis nostris; intuemur libenter, et usurpamus oculis; ex intuitu ad *συμπάθειαν* commovemur, et ad detestationi conjunctam *σύννυξιν* de peccatis nostris, in Judæos vehementius inflammamur; *Christi passionum tormentis compatimur*, et simul in memoriam revocamus non fuisse dolorem sicut dolorem Ejus; Cujus illa, ut Græci in suis liturgicis loquuntur, *ἄγνωστα παθήματα*, vocem illam dolorificam expresserunt, 'Deus meus, Deus meus, ut quid Me dereliquisti?' atque hinc ab intuitu isto invitati ad amandum amore nostro amorem Illius excitamur, Qui propter amorem nostri, ut Augustinus loquitur, semetipsum *ἐκένωσεν*, exinanivit. . . . . Hæc *et hujuscemodi nemo nostrum negat, saltem negare nemo potest*, ex intuitu efficacius ad animum et intimos cordium affectus descendere, eoque magis commendantur, *in usu posita quotidiano*, quo, tardiores cum simus ad hæc magnalia Dei recolenda, *pluribus indigemus et efficacissimis adjumentis*."—Orig. Eccles. vol. ii. p. 102.

"The Church of England condemneth not the historical use of Images. The Homily that seems to condemn all making of Images is to be understood with a restriction *of making them to an unlawful end.*"—Appello Cæsarem, p. 258.

"Civilem usum [imaginum] ac moralem statuo ad intuitum ac invitationem, nullum religiosum ad adorationem; an vero ad intuitum et invitationem constituerentur in locis sacris et sacratis conventibus destinatis, sunt qui negant, ex Origene, Arnobio, Minutio Felice; *sed non persuadent.* Successerunt tempora, cum frequentius in templis locarentur; sed tantum ad intuitum et invitationem. Tempora illa *laudamus*, et *imitamur*. Admiramur ingentes illas animas quæ, ceu luminaria, orbem ecclesiasticum illustrarunt, et cum Carolo Magno ad Hadrianum primum, 'permittimus Sanctorum Imagines, quicunque eas formare voluerit, tam in Ecclesia

quam extra, propter amorem Dei, et Sanctorum Ejus; *adorare* prohibemus; frangere vel destruere eas etiamsi quis voluerit, non permittimus.' Hæc ille Carolus Magnus. Hæc ille, ita nos." — Origines Ecclesiasticæ [2], vol. ii. p. 102.

Thorndike.

"Now, granting that Epiphanius and the Council of Elvira did hold all Images in churches dangerous for idolatry, (of which there is appearance,) it is manifest that they were afterwards admitted all over. And there might be *jealousy of offence in having Images in churches before idolatry was quite rooted out, of which afterwards there might be no appearance* [3]. But no manner of appearance that images in history should occasion idolatry to those Images in them that hold them the Images of God's creatures, such as are those Images which represent histories of the Saints, out of the Scriptures, or other relations of unquestionable credit. The second Council of Nice seems to have brought in, or authorized, addresses to solitary Images of Saints, placed upon pillars for that purpose; whereof there is much mention in the records of it. But to the Images of Saints, there can be no idolatry, so long as men take them for Saints, that is God's creatures, much less to the Images of

[2] This was his last work, published several years after his acquittal by the Bishops.

[3] This view, (intimated also by Bishop Mountague in the preceding passage) seems to meet the objection which has been drawn against the use of Images in later times of the Church, from the disuse of them in the earlier. Surely the Church has power to order all such matters according to circumstances, and, in such cases, her practice at any one particular time (though, accidentally, more ancient) will be no guide whatever for other times.

our Lord. For it is the honour of our Lord, and not of His image.

"For indeed and in truth, *it is not the Image, but the Principal, that is honoured, by the honour that is said to be done to the Image*, because it is done before the Image. The fountain and utensils of the Church were honoured, in the spotless times of the Church, as consecrated to God's service; though the honour of them, being incapable of honour for themselves, was manifestly, and without any scruple, the honour of God. But Images, so long as they were used to no farther intent than the ornament of churches, the remembrance of holy histories, and the raising of devotion; thereby, (as at the first they were used by the Church,) came in the number of things consecrated to God's service. And that Council was never of force in the West till the usurped power of the Pope brought it in by force. Nor did the Western Church, when it refused the Council, discharge the having of Images in churches upon those reasons, and to those purposes which I have declared. So far they remain still justifiable. For he that *sees the whole Church on the one side, and only Calvin on the other side*, hath he not cause to fear, that they who *make them idolaters without cause will themselves appear schismatics* in the sight of God for it? For what are they else, who please themselves in a strange kind of *negative superstition*, that they cannot serve God, if they serve Him with visible signs of reverence? Who hate the Images because they hate the Saints themselves and their Christianity? And, therefore, that it be not thought that we are tied to those terms of distance, which ignorant preachers drive their factions with; it is necessary to declare the grounds of truth, though it displease."—"Just Weights and Measures," p. 127.

Bishop Andrewes.

"For these Relics (were we sure they were true and uncounterfeit) we would carry to them the regard that becometh us. But the Cardinal himself will not say, that St. Hierome ever meant to *adore* the ashes of St. John the Baptist. St. Jerome opposed Vigilantius, that used reproachful terms to the ashes and relics of Martyrs, calling them 'vilem pulvisculum,' &c., for which he was, and was to be, justly censured.

"And (even) the carrying them about in linen cloths and kissing them . . . . . we would rather *bear with, and excuse, as proceeding from popular and private devotion*, than commend."—"Answer to XVIIIth Chapter of Cardinal Perron." No. vii.

Bishop Mountague.

"Reliquias ipsorum, lipsana, cimelia, deposita, si quæ sint, quæ ad nostram notitiam pervenerint, si quæ nancisci poterimus genuina, non fucata, libenter suscipimus, et *veneratione sua debita, congrua, honoramus;* constet autem hoc, et facile conveniet inter nos de Sanctorum Reliquiis venerandis."—Orig. Eccl. vol. i. p. 39.

"Magnam certe gratiam ab Ecclesia Christi et partibus inter se contendentibus is vel illi inirent, qui docerent, quousque progredi *in hoc Sanctorum cultu et lipsanodoulia* possimus, sine justo scandalo, animæ periculo, naufragio pietatis et religionis."—Ibid. p. 40.

"Ossa Sanctorum, cineres, reliquias, vase aureo, velamine pretioso, convolvebant. *Ego certe cum Constantino* illas Reliquias fasciis involvam, auro includam, circumgestandas; admovebo labiis, ac collo suspensas, manibus oculisque crebro usurpatas intuebor."—"Antidiatriba," p. 17.

IV.

INTERMEDIATE STATE OF PURIFICATION.

Bishop Forbes.

"Ad controversiam hanc tollendam, vel saltem minuendam, Romanenses opinionem suam de Purgatorio *punitivo* quum nullis certis fundamentis, nec in Scripturis, nec in primorum seculorum Patribus, nec in priscis conciliis, nitatur, ut supra demonstratum est, pro fidei articulo nec habeant ipsimet, neque aliis obtrudant. Protestantes etiam, quibus opinio ista improbatur, et quidem jure meritoque, hæreseos tamen, aut impietatis, apertè eandem ne damnent. Sententiæ autem communi Græcorum, atque etiam quorundam virorum doctorum in Latinâ Ecclesiâ de Purgatorio *expiatorio*, (quod solum Purgatorii nomen proprie loquendo meretur,) in quo, sine pœnis gehennalibus, animæ Sanctorum, quorum quasi media quædam conditio est, in cœlis quidem, sed in cœlorum loco, soli Deo noto, magis magisque usque ad diem visionis Dei claræ fruentes conspectu et consortio humanitatis Christi et sanctorum angelorum, perficiunt se in Dei charitate per fervida et morosa suspiria, ut supra dictum est, neutri pertinaciter obluctentur. Suâ enim, atque eâ quidem haud exiguâ probabilitate minime destituitur."—Consid. Mod. &c. p. 266.

V.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS.

Bishop Andrewes.

"We deny not but that the title of Sacrament hath sometimes been given by the Fathers unto all the Five in a larger

signification. But so also to many things more; the whole matter is a mere λογομαχία."—Answer to Card. Perron.

Thorndike.

"But for the justifying of ceremonies, why should I allege any thing but those Offices of the Church which the Fathers have called Sacraments, as well as Baptism and the Eucharist? . . That which I am to say of them here, consists of two points. That they are offices necessary to be ministered to all Christians concerned in them; and that they are to be solemnized with those ceremonies, for which they are, without any cause of offence, called Sacraments by the Fathers of the Church."—Just Weights and Measures, p. 118.

Then he proceeds:

"1. (Confirmation.) The gift of the Holy Ghost which Baptism promiseth, dependeth upon the Bishop's blessing.

"2. (Orders.) If the profession of Christianity infer the grace of Baptism, shall not the profession of that Christianity which the state of the Clergy in general, or that particular degree to which every man is ordained, importeth, infer the grace which the discharge of it requireth?

"3. (Penance.) If a Christian, after Baptism, fall into any grievous sin, voiding the effect of Baptism, can it fall within the sense of a Christian to imagine, that he can be restored by a *Lord have mercy upon me?* No; it must cost him hot tears, &c., with fasting and alms, *to take revenge upon himself, to appease God's wrath*, and to mortify his concupiscence . . . . . if his sin be notorious he must then satisfy the Church, that he doth what is requisite to *satisfy God;* that is, to appease His wrath, and to recover

His grace, &c. . . . . If it be the Power of the Keys that makes the Church, *it will be hard to show the face of a Church*, where the blessing of the Church, and the Communion of the Eucharist is granted, and yet no Power of the Keys at all exercised. Nay, it will appear a lamentable case, to consider, how simple innocent Christians are led on till death in an opinion, that they want nothing requisite for the pardon and absolution of their sins, when it is manifest that they want the Keys of the Church, as it is manifest, that the Keys are not used for that purpose.

"4. (EXTREME UNCTION.) St. James ordaineth that the Presbyters of every Church pray for the sick with a promise of pardon for their sins . . . . . He requireth them also to *anoint the sick with oil*, promising recovery upon it. . . . . Neither is there any cause why the same benefit should not be expected, but the decay of Christianity in the Church. . . . . So the unction of the sick is to recover health, not prepare for death, (as the Church of Rome now useth it,) but supposing the health of the soul restored by the Keys of the Church.

5. "(MARRIAGE.) As for Marriage, the solemnity of the blessing, the ring, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which, *according to the custom of the whole Church*, it ought to be ministered with, will easily make it a Sacrament."

Bishop Mountague.

"Bellarmine saith that Calvin admitteth Ordination for a Sacrament. And Bellarmine doth not belie Calvin, for he doth so indeed. . . . . Impositionem manuum Sacramentum esse concedo. (l. iv. c. xix. s. 31.) How that is . . . . . he expresseth himself, (ib. c. iv. s. 20.) . . . . . non invitus patior vocari Sacramentum . . . . . inter *ordinaria* Sacramenta, non numero. No Papist living, I think, will say, or desire, more. It is not for *all*, but for

some. Which saying of his is semblably expressed in that short, small, but perfect, Catechism in our Communion Book, where . . . . . is said . . . . . Two *only, as generally necessary, &c.* not excluding others from that *name* and *designation*, though from the *prerogative* and *degree.*"—Appello Cæs. c. xxxiii.—(Points of Popery.)

GENERAL COUNCILS.

Bishop Mountague.

"The Church of England may seem to have been of a contrary mind in her determinations; and to have taught, and prescribed to be so taught, that such General Councils, true and lawful, not only may err for possibility, but also have erred in reality. For Article xxi. we read thus: "General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, for as much as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things appertaining unto God." Which decision of the Article is not home to this purpose. First, The Article avoucheth, that General Councils have erred: which cannot be understood of my limitation, fundamentals; because there is no such Extat of any General Council, true and lawful. Secondly, things appertaining unto God are not all fundamentals; but points of piety, God's service, and religion, which admit a very large interpretation. For many things appertain unto God, that are not of necessity unto salvation, both in practice and speculation. In these haply General Councils have erred; in those other, none can err. The Council of Nice determined the controversy of Easter: it was not fundamental. I put the case, that in it they erred. It was a thing appertaining unto God, in His service: this may come under the sense and censure

of the Article; but this toucheth not my opinion concerning only Fundamentals. Thirdly, The Article speaketh at large concerning General Councils, both for debating and deciding. I only spake of the determination: wherein it may be possibly they nor can, nor shall err, that may and have erred in the discussing. In that very Council of Nice, it was an error in debating, though not fundamental, touching that yoke of single life, which they had meant once to have imposed upon the Church: but in conclusion they erred not. Paphnutius gave better advice, and they followed it. The Article may very well have aimed at this difference in Prosecution and Decision, in saying, All are not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, which is most true; but some are: and those some, in all probability, ever may prevail, as ever hitherto in such Councils in those cases they have prevailed, against the greater part formerly resolved otherwise. Again, The Article speaketh of General Councils indefinitely, without precisely determining which are General, which not; what is a General Council, what not: and so may, and doth include reputed or pretended General Councils, *univocè* General, though not exactly and truly indeed (such as was the Council of Ariminum) whereof I did not so much as intend to speak; my speech being limited with true and lawful: of which sort are not many to be found. Lastly, The Article speaketh of things that are *controversæ fidei* and *contentiosi juris*. I speak of things plainly delivered in Holy Scripture: for such are the fundamental points of our faith. And that it is so, the ensuing words of the Article do insinuate; things necessary unto salvation, must be taken out of Scripture alone. Councils have no such over-awing power and authority, as to tie men to believe, upon pain of damnation, without express warrant of God's Word, as is rightly resolved in the Article. They are but interpreters of the law;

they are not absolute to make such a law. Interpretation is required but in things of doubtful issue: our fundamentals are no such. Councils are supposed not to exceed their commission, which warranteth them to debate and determine questions and things *litigiosi status*. If they do not *hoc agere* sincerely, if they shall presume to make laws without warrant, and new articles of faith, (who have no farther authority than to interpret them,) laws without God's Word, that shall bind the conscience, and require obedience upon life and death; our Church will not justify their proceedings, nor do I."—Appello Cæs. (Points of Popery.)

THE CASE OF BISHOP MOUNTAGUE IN THE REIGN OF KING JAMES I.

THE following account of the proceedings against Bishop Mountague is taken from the "Biographia Britannica," vol. v. p. 3188.

"In 1622, some Romanists having attempted to proselyte one of his parishioners at Stamford-Rivers, to that Faith; not being able to procure a conference, he sent them three propositions in writing by way of challenge, in defence of the doctrine of the Church of England. In return to these, about eighteen months after, receiving a piece with this title, '*A Gagg for the Gospel*,' he wrote an answer to it, which being published in 1624, some tenets therein advanced raised such a flame against him among the Calvinistical Puritans, that two of the most zealous preachers in that way, at Ipswich, drew up several Articles, charging him with Popery and Arminianism, in order to present them to the Parliament. But our author having procured a copy of that paper, with an information of their design, immediately applied to the King for protection; who gave him leave to defend himself, and also to print his defence, if Dr. White, Dean of Carlisle, should approve his doctrine, as agreeable to that of the Church of England. Under these cautions, his famous treatise, entitled, '*Appello Cæsarem*," or a '*Just Appeal from two unjust Informers*,' was published in 1625, soon after the accession of king Charles the First to the throne. But the Calvinistical

principles being still warmly espoused, his book was taken under examination by the House of Commons, and several proceedings there were held against him in the two first parliaments of that reign. The divines also published a great number of answers thereto. However, he found means to defeat the attempts of all his opponents ; and, upon the death of one of them, Dr. George Carleton, Bishop of Chichester, in 1628, he was nominated by his Majesty to that see. In which he was confirmed (though not without an extraordinary opposition,) on Friday, August 22nd, that year, and consecrated the Sunday following at Croydon. He was allowed to hold the rectory of Petworth, of which he had been possessed some years *in commendam ;* and having obtained a special pardon from his Majesty, he applied himself closely to his favourite study of Church antiquities, and first published his '*Originum Ecclesiasticarum Apparatus*,' at Oxford, 1635 ; which was followed in 1636 by his '*Originum Ecclesiasticarum tomus primus*.' In 1638, upon the promotion of Dr. Matthew Wren to Ely, our author was translated to Norwich."

In the notes to the above passage is contained a particular account of the several tenets objected to Bishop Mountague, with the grounds of the objection. It is as follows:

" Those [objectionable statements] touching popery were, 1. That the Church representative cannot err, p. 45. 2. That the Fathers did not any way fail, nor did darkness possess their clear understandings, chap. viii. p. 113. 3. He calleth the doctrine of the invisibility of the Church a private opinion, no doctrinal decision of the Protestants. 4. That the Bishop of Rome personally is not Antichrist, nor yet the Bishops of Rome successively are that Anti-

christ, *magnus ille Antichristus*. 5. That a sinner is justified when he is made just, that is, translated from a state of nature to a state of grace, which act is motion, as they speak, between two terms, consisting in forgiveness of sins primarily, and grace infused secondarily, in which doctrine of Justification he accordeth fully with the Council of Trent, (Sess. vi. chap. 37.) and contradicteth the doctrine of the Church of England in the book of Homilies, (Sermon of Salvation,) and all other reformed Churches. 6. He so extends *meritum ex condigno*, that he would make men believe there is no material difference betwixt us and the Papists, in this point. 7. That touching evangelical counsels, he saith, 'I know no doctrine of our English Church against them.' 8. That howsoever in words he denieth *limbus patrum*; yet thus he writeth, 'The Patriarchs, Prophets, and Fathers, that lived and died before Christ, the Scripture resolveth they were not there, where now they are, in the highest heavens, there where the glorified body of Christ is now residing, at the right hand of God.' chap. xli. p. 27. 9. Touching Images he writeth thus: 'Images have three uses assigned by your schools; stay there, go no farther, and we charge you not with idolatry. *Institutionem rudium*, *commonefactionem historiæ*, *et exercitationem devotionis*, you and we also give unto them. (chap. xliii. p. 300, 301.) Images in Gregory's times were very much improved, to be books for the simple and ignorant people; hold you there, and we blame you not:' and a little after, 'Images are not utterly unlawful unto Christians in all manner of religious employment. The pictures of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and Saints, may be made, and had in houses, and set up in churches. The Protestants have them, they despight them not; respect and honour may be given unto them. Protestants do it, and use them for helps of piety,' (which directly contradicteth the doctrine of the Church of England in the book of Homilies.)

10. Of signing our children only in Baptism with the sign of the cross, he speaketh very superstitiously. 'We use signing with the sign of the cross, both on the forehead, and elsewhere. Caro signatur ut anima muniatur, said Tertullian, and so we. Chap. 46, he citeth and approveth the testimony of one of them,' (Athanas. de Incarn. Verbi, p. 61.) 'By the sign of the cross of Christ all magic spells are disappointed, witchcraft and sorcery cometh to nothing; all idols are confounded and forsaken.' 'He professeth that he knoweth no cause of such distraction and disaffection betwixt us and the Papists, for the reverent use of signing with the sign of the cross.' Chap. viii. p. 60. He saith, 'Joshua prevailed against Amalek through the sign of the cross, rather than by the sword.' 11. Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, he writeth very popishly; for first he calleth the Supper of the Lord, in express terms, *the Sacrament of the Altar*, and afterwards, more fully: 'But that you were bred up,' says he, 'in a faction, otherwise you would acknowledge there need be no difference betwixt the Papists and us in the point of Real Presence,' p. 253. And again, 'No man denieth a change, an alteration, a *transmutation*, a *transelementation*, as they speak.' 12. Touching confession, 'We require,' says he, 'men to make special Confession, if they find their consciences troubled with any matter, either when they be sick, or before receiving of the Lord's Supper;' his words are, 'in the case of perplexity, for the quieting of men disturbed in their consciences.' 13. He taketh no exception to his adversary for calling it [Ordination] *the Sacrament of Holy Orders*. But denieth our Church to hold any such opinion, as that no inferior grace is given by imposition of hands in the Sacrament of Holy Orders, chap. xxviii. p. 269. 14. Touching the power of the Priest to forgive sins, 'this is the doctrine,' saith he, 'of our Communion book, and the practice of our Church

accordingly, that the Priests have power not only to pronounce, but to give, remission of sins, chap. xi. p. 78, 79. And it is confessed, that all Priests, and none but Priests have power to forgive sin.' "

Then follow the several heads of allegation.

"After a preamble containing the charge in general from his three books, '*An Answer to the late Gagg of the Protestants*,' '*A Treatise of the Invocation of Saints*,' and '*Appello Cæsarem*,' *as contrary to the Articles of* 1562, it begins thus: 'Article 1. Whereas in the thirty-fifth of the Articles abovementioned, it is declared that the second book of the Homilies doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, in the tenth homily of which book it is determined, that the Church of Rome, as it is at present, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and upwards, is so far gone from the nature of a true Church, that nothing can be more; he, the said R. Mountague, in several places of his said book, called 'An Answer to the Gagger,' chap. v. p. 49. and in his other book, called 'Appello,' &c. doth advisedly maintain and affirm, that the Church of Rome is, and ever was, a true Church since it was a Church. Article 2. Whereas in the said homily, it is likewise declared, that the Church of Rome is not built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles; and in the twenty-eighth of said Articles, that Transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament; and in the twenty-fifth of the said Articles, that Five other reputed Sacraments of the Church of Rome are not to be accounted Sacraments: yet *contrary*, and *repugnant hereunto*, he, the said Richard Mountague, doth maintain and affirm in his book aforesaid, called the 'Answer to the Gagg,' p. 50, that the Church of Rome hath ever remained firm upon the same Foundation of Sacraments and Doctrine instituted by God. Article 3.

Thirdly, in the nineteenth of the same Articles, it is further determined, that the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their use and manner of ceremonies, but also in matter of faith. He, the said Richard Mountague, speaking of those points which belong to faith and manners, hope and charity, doth in the same book, called the 'Gagger,' p. 14, affirm and maintain, that none of those are controverted *inter partes*, meaning the Protestants and the Papists; and that notwithstanding, in the thirty-fourth Article it is resolved, that the sacrifices of masses, in which, as is commonly said, the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain and guilt too, are blasphemous follies and dangerous deceits: this being one of the points controverted between the Church of England and the Church of Rome; the said Richard Mountague, in his book called the 'Gagger,' p. 14, doth affirm and maintain, that the controverted points are of a less and inferior allay: of them a man may be ignorant, without any danger of his salvation; a man may resolve, or oppose this, or that, or any, without peril of perishing for ever. Article 4. Whereas, in the third homily, intitled, 'Against peril of Idolatry,' it is declared that Images read no good lesson neither of God nor godliness, but all error and wickedness; he, the said Richard, in the book aforesaid, called the 'Answer to the late Gagger,' p. 38, doth affirm and maintain, that Images may be used for the instruction of the ignorant, and excitation of devotion. Article 5. That in the same it is plainly expressed, that the attributing the defence of some countries to Saints, is a spoiling God of his honour, and that such Saints are but *as Dii Tutelares* of the Gentile idolaters, the said Richard Mountague, hath, notwithstanding, in the book aforementioned, affirmed and maintained, that Saints have not only a memory, but a more peculiar charge of their friends, and that it may be admitted, that some Saints

have a peculiar patronage, custody, protection, and power, as Angels also have over certain persons and countries, by especial deputation, and that it is no impiety so to believe.

. . . . . .

"Item. 'The scope and end of the said Richard Mountague in the books aforementioned, is to give encouragement to Popery, and to withdraw his Majesty's subjects from the true religion established to the Roman superstition; and, consequently, to be reconciled to the see of Rome. All which he laboureth by subtle and cunning ways; whereby God's true religion hath been much scandalized; and those mischiefs introduced, which the wisdom of many laws hath endeavoured to prevent, to the great peril and hazard of our sovereign lord the king, and of all his dominions and loving subjects. Lastly, that the aforesaid Richard Mountague hath, in the aforesaid book, called the 'Appeal,' divers passage dishonourable to the late king and his Majesty's father, of famous memory; full of bitterness, railing, and injurious to several other persons; disgraceful and contemptuous to many worthy divines, both of this Church of England, and other reformed Churches beyond the seas; impious and profane in scoffing at preaching, meditating, conferring, pulpits, lectures, bibles, and all show of religion: all which do aggravate his former offences, as having proceeded from malicious and envenomed hate against the peace of this Church, and sincerity of the reformed religion publicly professed, and by law established in this kingdom.

" 'All which offences being to the high dishonour of Almighty God, and of most mischievous effect and consequence against the good of His Church and common weal of England, and of all his Majesty's realms and dominions; The Commons assembled in parliament do hereby pray, that the said Richard Mountague may be punished according to his demerits, in that exemplary manner as may deter

others from attempting so presumptuously to disturb the peace of Church and State, and that the books aforesaid may be suppressed and burnt.' "

In reference to the foregoing history, it is important to observe: 1. That the persons who brought these charges against Bishop Mountague were *Puritans;* and that the whole proceeding was one of the earlier stages of a movement which issued in the Great Rebellion. 2. That, accordingly, it was *Arminianism*, as well as, and rather than, "Popery," which was objected. 3. That the proceedings were instituted not by the Church, but by *the House of Commons.* 4. That the allegations were founded in part upon a book (the Appello Cæsarem,) written by Bishop Mountague *in his own vindication*, and consequently with peculiar caution, and with the *utmost degree of qualification* which he could conscientiously make. In this treatise, so far from retracting, or explaining away, previous statements, he is found, (like the writer of Tract 90., in his explanations to Dr. Jelf and the Bishop of Oxford,) to *repeat*, and *maintain*, them. 5. That *contrariety to the Articles and Homilies* is the ground of charge.

It remains only to narrate the result. The king, at the instance of the House of Commons, laid the whole matter before a Committee of the Bishops, consisting of the following:

George Montaigne, Bishop of London.
Richard Neyle, Bishop of Durham.

Launcelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester.
John Buckeridge, Bishop of Rochester, (President of St. John's College, Oxford.)
William Laud, Bishop of St. David's, (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.)[1]

The letter containing the judgment of this body of representative Prelates, is preserved in the British Museum, (Harl. MS. 7000. Art. 104.) The following is an exact copy:—

"To the Right Honourable, our very good Lord, the Duke of Buckingham, his Grace.

"May it please your Grace,

"Upon your late Letters, directed to the Bishop of Winchester, signifying his Majesties pleasure, that taking to Him the Bishops of London, Durham, Rochester, Oxford, and St. David's, or some of them, He and They should take into consideration the busines concerning Mr. Mountagu's late Booke, and deliver their opinions touching the same, for the preservation of the truth and the peace of the Church of England, together with the safetie of Mr. Mountagu's person; We have met and considered, and for our particulars doe think that Mr. Mountagu, in his Booke, hath not affirmed any thing to be the doctrine of the Church of England, but that which in our opinions is the doctrine of the Church of England, or agreeable thereunto. And for the preservation of the peace of the Church, wee

[1] It is remarkable that the decision in the case of Bishop Mountague was pronounced by a body, constituted precisely in the same way with that which *originally* sanctioned the Thirty-nine Articles; viz. a Committee of Bishops, nominated by the king.

in humilitie doe conceive, That his Majestie shall doe most gratiously to prohibite all parties members of the Church of England any further controverting of those questions by publick preaching, or writing, or any other way, to the disturbance of the peace of this Church, for the time to come. And for any thing that may further concerne Mr. Mountagu's person in that busines, we humbly commend him to his Majesties gratious favour and pardon. And so we humbly recommend your Grace to the protection of the Almightie, resting

" Your Grace's faithfull and humble Servants,

(Signed) " Geo. London.
R. Dunelm.
La. Winton.
Jo. Roffens.
Guil. Meneve."

" From Winchester House,
January 16, 1625."

ADDENDA.

Page 14. Note.

The words in this extract, which declare that Roman Catholics were not pressed at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth to "join" her "sect" or "deny their Faith," undoubtedly intimate *the writer's opinion*, that the former of these acts would have been tantamount to the latter, and so far make against the present view. However, *the fact* was not as he states, for, as is shown farther on, the Roman Catholics *were* pressed to subscribe the Articles, and did subscribe them.

Page 20.

It has been customary with writers who have been offended by the Catholic tone of the Prayer-book (e. g. the Athanasian Creed, or parts of the Baptismal service) to contend that the Reformers yielded, in such matters, to the "prejudices of their time." This view has been put forth, especially, by the late Mr. Scott, of Aston Sandford. Again, a Clergyman of the Established Church, in our own days, whose zeal all must respect, has proposed to *bracket* certain expressions in the office for the Visitation of the Sick, &c., as at least "*equivocal*," "*unwise*," &c. (See Brit. Mag., No. cxvi. July 1841.) All this is to the present point.

Page 27.

It may be observed that Mr. Newman, in his view of the subject of the Papal Supremacy, does not deny, that union with the rest of Christendom under one visible government is the most perfect state of the Church, but only that it is *essential to the very being*

of a Church. The distinction is clearly pointed out in a very interesting and striking letter, which has lately appeared in *l' Univers*, with the signature, "Un jeune membre de L' Université d'Oxford." The genuineness of this letter has, I believe, been questioned, but, I may add, without the slightest foundation.

"La Papauté . . . est plutôt la forme accidentelle, que la forme essentielle, de l'Eglise; c' est à dire, elle ressemble plutôt à la *chaleur*, qu' à la *vie*, de l'Eglise."

Page 28.

In saying that there is no instance of any political enactment, bearing upon Catholic doctrine, "between the Reformation and Revolution," I have named too wide an interval. The first attempt made, on the part of the State, to interfere with *doctrine*, was, I believe, in 1673, when the Test Act, and Declarations against Transubstantiation and Invocation of Saints, on the ground of idolatry, were introduced as a qualification for offices of trust. These securities, as Mr. Hallam observes in his "Constitutional History of England," were added in consequence of the Oath of Supremacy being found ineffectual; not, then, from *religious*, but from purely *political* motives; the State thus venturing to tamper with the holiest of subjects for its own subordinate ends. The new restrictions were forced upon the court by what is called the "country party," termed, as Mr. Hallam tells us, (vol. ii. p. 525.) by the court, *factious*, *fanatical*, and *republican*. In 1679 the same declaration was imposed upon members of both Houses of Parliament, at the time of taking their seats. Between these two periods, Mr. Hallam says, "the clergy in their sermons, even the most respectable of their order, Sancroft, Sharpe, Barlow, Burnet, Stillingfleet, called for the severest laws against Catholics" (in consequence of Titus Oates's plot). On the other hand, however, the essay noticed in this pamphlet ("Considerations on the True Way of suppressing Popery, &c.") was published during this interval, with the view of opposing the attempt to put any restriction at all upon *loyal*

Roman Catholics. This essay is commonly attributed to Bishop Barlow, although the name of that prelate is in Mr. Hallam's list. But, whatever may have been the sentiments of the clergy, certain it is that the measures of 1679 emanated from no quarter in which they exercised influence, but, as Mr. Hallam tells us, (p. 580.) from the "popular party [1]." Nothing more was done till the year 1700, when an attempt was made to enforce the above-mentioned Declaration upon the children of Roman Catholics, at the age of 18, as a condition of the tenure of landed property.

Page 29. Note.

"The fate of this rubric is worthy of notice. It was excluded by Queen Elizabeth in 1559; and its removal clearly shows, that the *Church could not then be brought to express an opinion adverse to the Real Presence.* It was restored in 1661, on the revision of King Charles II.; and its *reappearance may likewise be employed to show*, that the Church, at that time also, was unwilling to make any declaration on that important tenet. *To prevent misapprehension on this point*, the words 'real and essential' . . . . were altered into *the very different expression*, 'corporal.' "—Dr. Cardwell, "History of Conferences," p. 35, note.

[1] It is curious that Mr. Hallam, in a note on this subject, draws the same distinction, for which Mr. Newman has been so much blamed, between the Roman doctrine and practice, and seems to justify assent to the Declaration then imposed on the part of an individual, prepared to condemn the *latter* alone. "Invocation of Saints," he says, "as held and explained by that Church in the Council of Trent, is surely not idolatrous, with whatever error it may be charged; but the practice at least of uneducated Roman Catholics seems *fully to justify the Declaration;* understanding it to refer to certain superstitions, countenanced, or not eradicated, by their Clergy."

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

E. S. Thackeray Esq.
with the Author's Co

THE CASE OF CATHOLIC SUBSCRIPTION TO THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES CONSIDERED.

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

THE CASE OF

CATHOLIC SUBSCRIPTION

TO THE

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

CONSIDERED:

WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE

DUTIES AND DIFFICULTIES OF ENGLISH CATHOLICS

IN THE PRESENT CRISIS:

IN A LETTER

TO THE

HON. MR. JUSTICE COLERIDGE.

BY THE

REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE,

PROFESSOR OF POETRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

AND VICAR OF HURSLEY, HANTS.

LONDON.—1841.

NOT PUBLISHED.

A

LETTER,

&c.

My dear Friend,

I must begin by returning you my most sincere thanks for your kindness in allowing your name to stand at the head of the considerations which I have now to offer on a very serious and rather painful subject. Without in the least committing you to any statement or sentiment which may fall from me, I nevertheless feel that such friendly countenance may do much in disposing men to think fairly and deliberately of the view which I have been led to take: in itself a sufficiently obvious one, yet such as may very well escape observation, when people are excited, and think themselves called on to make up their minds in a hurry. There seems some reason to apprehend a feeling of this sort, and that in quarters of no mean influence, regarding the attempt which has recently been made to obviate certain objections to the Thirty-nine Articles, and to reconcile sub-

scription to them with Catholic principles. Persons seem unusually inclined to act and speak hastily on that subject.

This alone, considering the importance of the matter, might excuse an endeavour, however weak, and however insignificant the quarter from which it proceeds, to urge a little more patient reflection and inquiry, before steps are taken, which it may be desirable, but impossible, to retrace. But he who now addresses you has a personal reason, which may partly acquit him of presumption in thus coming forward, whatever other censure it may draw upon him; *viz.* that he is himself responsible, as far as any one besides the actual writer can be, for the Tract on which so severe a condemnation has lately been pronounced by the Heads of Houses at Oxford; having seen it in proof, and strongly recommended its publication[1]. He is now, therefore, naturally anxious to explain, as he best may, the grounds of an opinion which has drawn on him the recorded censure of a body which he is for so many reasons bound to respect.

The chief ground, indeed, has been already stated by Mr. Newman, *viz.* its being known as a fact, that persons imbued with Catholic principles, and desirous of carrying out in good faith the views which they seemed to themselves to have learned from sacred

[1] This, his responsibility, he avowed to the Board, before the result of their deliberations on the subject was known.

Antiquity, were in some points staggered by the tone and wording of the Articles. Thus the title of the Sixth Article, *The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture for Salvation*, might seem, at first sight, to dispense with the Church's office, as a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, and an enunciator of the Rule of Faith. To say "a man is justified by faith only," might appear to contradict St. James, and to be at variance with the constant use of the terms Justification, Merit, and the like, in the writings of the Fathers. The description of the visible Church, if taken as a strict definition, might seem to countenance the claims of the Congregationalists. The Article about Sacraments has a sound at variance with the well-known and constant phraseology of the old Church writers: that about Councils requires explanation, to be reconciled with what has always and every where been held, concerning those four at least, which the Church of England acknowledges.

On all these and similar points, explanations at length had been given in various works; and it seemed desirable to collect them in one, as a kind of manual to assist in what was believed to be the true, legitimate, catholic exposition of the Articles; whereby the scruples which were known to exist, and other similar ones, which may be expected to arise from time to time in the interpretation of them, as of other formularies, might be removed or allayed, and our adherence to primitive antiquity, so far, throughly reconciled with our allegiance to the Anglican Church.

Looking in another direction, one seemed to perceive an additional call for some brief and popular treatise to the above effect. From various quarters the cry of insincerity has been of late more and more loudly raised, against those who subscribing these Articles professed uncompromising reverence for the ancient Church; and it was supposed neither unreasonable nor uncharitable, to put within the reach of persons, who might find something plausible in such an outcry, the true account of the several points of detail, which at first sight would naturally tell in its favour.

If I may speak of myself individually, I will add that the general tone of the Tract, more especially of the Introduction, appeared to me so very instructive, so exactly what our present position requires, that it would have required some very grave reason indeed, to make me consent to its suppression. To explain myself, I will instance particularly one expression: the rather because it seems to have been understood by many quite in a different sense from what its author intended, and, as I should say, from what the context obviously requires. "Till her members are stirred up to this religious course, (of repentance, confession, and prayer, such as to win back the forfeited blessing of the Unity of the Spirit,) let the Church sit still; let her be content to be in bondage; let her work in chains; let her submit to her imperfections as a punishment; let her go on teaching with the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies, and inconsistent precedents, and

principles partially developed." In this I saw nothing but a condensed statement of the same fact which had been taught and illustrated in detail in a former Tract for the Times, No. 86; the drift of which is to show, that the deviations made in our Prayer Book from the more perfect and primitive forms may be accounted for, on the supposition of a special Providence, overruling them, to suit our decayed moral tone and condition: a view which, besides its intrinsic verisimilitude and importance, I knew had tended much to remove scruples, and to satisfy tender minds. And although that Tract refers directly only to the Prayer Book, yet its principle readily extends itself to other parts of the Church system; and among the rest to the Articles; as also to the relations between our Church and the State: a fact which was brought before me by the phrases "ambiguous formularies," "inconsistent precedents," and "principles but partially developed." Thus I saw nothing in the sense of what was said, which had not been taught at large long ago, without a shadow of scandal, as far as appears: and in the metaphor of "stammering lips," I seemed to see a beautiful and true adaptation of a most heavenly and condescending image from Holy Writ.[1] "*Whom shall He teach knowledge? and whom shall He make to understand doctrine? them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts. For precept must be upon*

[1] Isa. xxviii. 9—12.

precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line; here a little and there a little. For with stammering lips and another tongue will He speak to this people: to whom He said, 'This is the rest wherewith ye may cause the weary to rest, and this is the refreshing:' yet they would not hear." Is not the Prophet here telling us, how God in His great mercy feeds them with milk who have need of milk, though for the time they ought to be able to bear strong meat? how He speaks to them, as nurses to children, vouchsafing to imitate their imperfect tones? and why should it appear a thing offensive or incredible, that the dispensations of Providence with this Church should have proceeded by a similar rule? Or why should any of us take affront, at being advised to "refrain his soul and keep it low," in regard of this particular trial, the imperfections of the Church to which he belongs, as well as in the rest of his probation here? Is not the contrary the very sentiment, the prevalence whereof we lament in the Roman Church, and blame her writers and authorities for encouraging it?

I write this without communication with Mr. Newman, and am far from supposing that I enter into the full meaning of his words; but this is to my mind their obvious meaning: and until English churchmen, generally, sympathise with him so far, I see no chance of our Church assuming her true position in Christendom, or of the mitigation of our present "unhappy divisions."

For these reasons I wished the Tract published: nor did it occur to me that it was more likely to cause disgust, and excite animadversion and controversy, than former publications expressing the same views. I found hardly any thing in it, which had not been before avowed, and explained, and vindicated. Perhaps I did not sufficiently consider the difference involved in bringing the whole together, in a comparatively small compass, and in showing how it bore directly on an important practical question. But as to the doctrinal substance of the Tract, it seemed not unreasonable to hope that the same liberty would be allowed, as in other matters, at first sight at least equally serious. It is stating the case at the very lowest, to say, that the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, and of Apostolical Succession in the ministry, appear to be as expressly set forth in the Articles, and what is more, in the Liturgy, as the sufficiency of Scripture exclusive of tradition; or as Justification by Faith exclusive of works in all senses; or as the condemnation of the notion of Purgatory in every sense in which it has ever been held. Now whether, for many years past, liberties have been taken with these doctrines, in the way not only of explanation, but of absolute denial; whether the parties taking such liberties have been few, or uninfluential, or unconnected with the University; these are matters familiarly known to all men: but we have not heard of the promulgation of any official reprimand on any such occasion. This is stated not

as necessarily imputing any blame to the authors of the present censure: persons in high place must be allowed to judge for themselves, when it is their time to speak, and when to keep silence: but it may serve to account for our not anticipating such notice in the case of this Tract, more than on former occasions.

And this brings me to the particular topic, on which I am anxious to address my brethren through you. The hope we had of being allowed to exercise our old freedom of interpretation on these subjects has been more or less disturbed by what has taken place. There appears to be some chance of an authoritative prohibition of the view, which not this Tract only, but a whole army of writers, new and old, recommend: and it becomes a serious question, what ought to be the line of conduct adopted in such case by persons holding that view, and concerned in any way with subscription to the Articles.

It is a consoling, I trust we may say, a providential circumstance, that no *authoritative* censure has yet been passed. A resolution carried in the Board of Heads of Houses, I need hardly say, is not an act of the University: it is merely the opinion of the majority of individual members of the Board, happening to be present: worthy of much respect as an expression of opinion from persons in high place, but not laying any definite obligation on the conscience of those in inferior station: not what an episcopal sentence is to Churchmen within the dio-

cese; or an academical sentence, to members of the University. As yet (and we cannot be too thankful for it) we are under no *authoritative* censure: but what has occurred comes sufficiently near to that case, to make it matter of Christian prudence, that we should realize the possibility of it as well as we can, and try to obtain some general view of what our position and duties would be, should it ever (which God forbid) occur to any of us.

Suppose, *e. g.* that not the Heads of Houses, but the Academical Body in Convocation assembled, had determined that interpretations such as have been now (not for the first time) suggested, evade rather than explain the Articles, and are inconsistent with the duty of receiving and teaching them in good faith, to which the University, by express statute, binds her tutors and other members; how would a college tutor (to take the simplest case first) have to act under such circumstances, supposing him convinced that the condemned view is the right one? would it not be plain breach of a human trust, if he used the authority committed to him for the purpose of teaching that view? and of a still higher trust, if, in compliance with the academical law, he forbore to inculcate it?

It is very desirable that the *unavoidable extent* of this difficulty should be thoroughly understood. There is such a thing, we all know, as stating a case of conscience nakedly and drily, in such a way that no one shall be able to say the statement is

exactly untrue, yet the effect on the whole would be felt by every one to be unfairly exaggerated, the conclusion, if I may so speak, far too large for the premises. One would be very sorry to entangle any person in a scruple of that kind. But the ground of hesitation in the case imagined, would surely be very different. The words of the censure are very large: "interpretations, such as are suggested in the Tract," are condemned: of course, *all* such interpretations: of course, then, each particular definite one which is at all peculiar to the Tract, or those who are responsible for it. Now this is a very wide field: not to speak at present of its being indefinitely enlarged by the word *such;* which would impose on an instructor the task of considering, not merely whether a proposed explanation was contained in the obnoxious Tract, but whether it was of the same sort, and caste, and family. But to confine myself here to points actually stated in the Tract. Our inquirer's perplexity would begin with the sixth Article: he might have learned from some other quarter—from Field, perhaps, or Laud, or Tertullian [1], or St. Augustine [2], that Scripture alone is not the Rule of Faith, and in what sense it is not so: but he would find the same mode suggested as in the Tract, of reconciling this opinion with the Article: therefore he must not adopt that mode. Well, suppose him

[1] De Virg. Veland. 1. De Præscript. Hæret. 13.
Enchirid. c. 56.

to have found some other, quite free from the dreaded infection: he goes on to the next groupe of Articles (with a light or a heavy heart, as it may happen); and there he cannot evade the difficulty, before alluded to, about Justification by Faith only: but unless he could fall back on pure Lutheranism (which our hypothesis excludes) he will find it hard to give an interpretation which has not been more or less anticipated, either in the Tract or in the elaborate work of its writer on the same subject. Similar instances might be given in each following Article: but not to weary you, let him have arrived at that, which being specified in another document, may be thought to have been chiefly in the mind of the censors: the twenty-second Article, on Purgatory, Pardons, &c. Here of course his first object would be to know what was meant by "the Romish Doctrine:" and perhaps it might occur to him to look into the first draught of these Articles, set forth by Edward VI. in the year 1552, where he would find that the original phrase was "the doctrine of the school-men:" and he might conclude that he could hardly be wrong if he expounded the present Article to mean "the doctrine of the schoolmen, as it is developed in the present practices and teaching of the Church: in papal bulls, indulgences, authorized service books, fraternities founded or warranted by authority to offer certain prayers, or the like." But here again he would find himself all wrong, for on looking into the Tract, he would meet

with this sentence: "what is opposed is the received doctrine of the day, or the doctrine of the *Roman schools*." This, as far as circumstances guide us, would seem to be the point which of all others has excited most displeasure, and therefore it may seem that the censure refers to this suggestion particularly, as "evading rather than explaining the meaning of the Article." Against it, consequently, a tutor, desirous to act *bona fide* on the prohibition we have been supposing, would feel himself most especially set on his guard. Whatever he might do in any other Article, he could not, without breach of trust, adopt the suggestion of the Tract on this. Then the question would follow, What is "*Doctrina Romanensium*," if schoolmen, papal decrees, and ordinary clerical teaching, together do not justify that description? There might be some difficulty in replying to this; I will not therefore dwell upon it.

Perhaps now instances enough have been given to make it clear, that, had the censure unhappily been authoritative, it would have been no slight stumbling block in the way of academical tutors, who might, on other grounds, think it their duty so to interpret ambiguous phrases in the Articles, as to bring them most nearly into conformity with the primitive Church, and to throw no unnecessary censure on other Churches. Such persons would have been met at every turn by the recorded sentence of the University against them: in them it would have been no contumacy, but plain conscientiousness, to withdraw

from an engagement which they could not religiously fulfil.

It may be said, they might do the work of tutors, might conduct a young man's general education, without directly applying themselves to the teaching of the Articles. That particular subject they might leave to others, who agreed more nearly in judgment with the general body. But, in the first place, this plan would hardly satisfy a mind disposed to great exactness in matters of trust; since the University statutes make all tutors, and not here and there an occasional theological master, responsible for their pupils' understanding of and adherence to the Articles. Next, considerate Catholics know well, that there is, practically, no separating the high and comprehensive views which that name imports from any of the moral branches of education. Silence them as you may on directly theological questions, how are they to deal with ethics, or poetry, or history, so as not to guide their disciples by the light which the Church system reflects on all? And there is yet a deeper consideration: they may perhaps think that College tuition is a branch of the Pastoral Care; at least, if they be themselves ordained to serve at God's Altar: and then they will have no further alternative: they must either teach Catholicism, or not teach at all.

To pass from the case of those engaged in tuition, (which is also, *mutatis mutandis*, the case of those who appoint the University tutors): it would be matter of grave inquiry, whether any person, adhering to the

Articles in the sense pointed out by the Tract, could with an unblemished conscience become a member of the University, or even, without dispensation, continue such. This doubt arises from the acknowledged rule of the best casuists[1], that all oaths and covenants imposed by a superior, and especially subscriptions required to Articles of religion, are to be interpreted by the mind and purpose of the parties imposing, and in the sense which they intended. Waterland adds, in speaking of our Articles, the sense of the compilers also; but he presently modifies that part of his statement by subjoining [2], "The sense of the compilers, barely considered, is not always to be observed; but so far only as the natural and proper signification of words, or the intention of the imposers, binds it upon us. The sense of the compilers and imposers may generally be presumed the same; and therefore I mention both, one giving light to the other." This mode of speaking plainly implies, that he did not consider the sense of the compilers as being obligatory in itself, but only as being one of the most certain ways to ascertain, where otherwise doubtful, that of the imposers. That is to say, if there be no reason to the contrary, the natural meaning of the words, as at first drawn up, may be taken without hesitation as the meaning of the Church, or State, or University, calling on us to sign them. Still our *obligation* so to

[1] Bp. Sanderson de Juramenti Obligatione, Præl. vii. § 9; and as quoted by him, St. Aug. Epist. 125, 4; 126, 13.

[2] Case of Arian Subscription, c. iii. Works, ii. 288.

take them arises from our relation to the imposers, not to the compilers: or, as Mr. Newman has more concisely worded it, "We have no duties toward their framers." This is evident, on considering, that if an Article were ambiguous, it is competent to the same authorities which imposed it, to add a new Article, making the point clear: and it is the same thing, if they choose rather to declare that such and such is the signification of the old Article. Thus, whatever might be the meaning of the divines of King Edward, who compiled, or of those of Queen Elizabeth, who revised our Articles, as to Predestination and Election, and other kindred tenets, it was within the prerogative of the Church governors in King Charles the First's time to declare, that those Articles should not be interpreted by the rules of any modern school, but by the literal and grammatical signification of the words.

The plain and direct rule then is, that the Articles are to be subscribed to in the sense intended by those whose authority makes the subscription requisite. To prevent mistakes, though in a very plain matter, let it be here added, that by this expression, "the sense of the imposers," we do not of course mean the particular interpretation which the Bishops and other authorities for the time being might happen to put upon the several ambiguous passages, as most probable in their own private opinion. This could never be thought of for a rule, being a matter impos-

sible to be ascertained, and varying continually as Church offices drop and are filled up. "The sense of the imposers" can only mean, "the sense in which they intended to allow subscription:" plain and obvious, where the words of the formulary admit but of one interpretation: in other cases doubtful at first reading, yet capable of being fixed with any degree of certainty, by comparison of different passages; by the declarations of the parties; or, as in the case now supposed, by an authoritative rule of exposition superadded to the original formula.

We obey, then, the sense of the imposers, not only when we happen to agree with them in each particular interpretation, but also when our disagreement, known or unknown, extends not beyond the limits which they in their discretion are willing to allow: when we make no "open questions" beyond what they permit. Now, from the Reformation downwards, both English Churchmen in general, and academical men in particular, have had at least so much warrant as this for interpreting the Articles in the Catholic sense. And to prevent cavil, I will here explain what I understand by the Catholic sense. I understand the phrase to mean, "that sense which is most conformable to the ancient rule, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*" When a doubtful expression occurs in a formulary, it seems to me catholic to interpret it so as may best agree with the known judgment of the primitive, and as

yet undivided, Church. Again, it seems catholic to interpret it so as to cast the least unnecessary [1] censure on other portions of the existing Church: more especially where they form the great majority of Christendom: both because such would be the natural sentiment of a mind trained to think much of the supernatural fellowship of Christians one among another; and because, argumentatively, *quod ubique*, and *quod ab omnibus*, are presumptions in favour of *quod semper*, until the contrary has been proved. These I take to be the grounds and principles of the mode of exposition, of late so severely censured: grounds and principles which would not be shaken by proving here and there an error of application or detail; though as yet I am not aware that anything material, even of that kind, has been or can be substantiated, as against the statements of the Tract.

May we not appeal without hesitation to the whole tenor of English Church history, for the fact, that this,—which I will venture to go on calling the Catholic acceptation of the Articles,—has been allowed by proper authorities in every generation? although in equity the *onus probandi* lies with those

[1] By "unnecessary," I mean here, "not required, humanly speaking, for the prevention of serious error in doctrine or practice." And as an example, I would instance the Articles never charging the Churches of Greece or Rome with idolatry; as also their stigmatizing the tenets about purgatory, &c., not as overthrowing the foundations of the faith, but as "a fond thing vainly invented, and not proveable from Scripture, but rather repugnant to it."

who would now put it down. They may be fairly challenged to name the time, when either the Bishops or the Universities of England have limited, as some would now limit, the sense in which the Articles are to be subscribed. But we have moreover this positive presumption in our favour, that the first imposers of the Articles, who were some of them [1] also among their original compilers, did in effect not only allow, but even enjoin and recommend the Catholic sense of them. It has been often repeated of late, but does not seem to have been sufficiently noticed, —I will therefore here set it down once more :—that the same convocation, in the same set of canons, which first required subscription to the Articles in 1571, enjoined also that preachers should "in the first place be careful never to teach any thing from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and collected out of that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops." It seems no violent inference, that the appointed measure of doctrine preached, was also intended to be the measure of doctrine delivered in the way of explanation of doubtful passages in formularies. The first generation, therefore, of subscribers to the Articles might well think they had something more than permission to interpret them on Catholic principles. What was to hinder the next from taking the benefit of the same canon;

[1] Bishops Horne and Grindall. See Strype, Cranm. b. ii. c. 27.

and the next to them, and so on, quite down to our time; unless some authoritative declaration to the contrary can be produced? But the only interferences by authority that I am aware of were the King's declaration before mentioned, the re-enactment of subscription in 1662, and the directions of William in 1695, repeated by George I. at his accession. In the two first, the *animus imponentis* cannot be supposed less favourable to Catholic views, than that of the synod in Queen Elizabeth's time; and the last relates exclusively to the fundamentals of the faith, as contained in the five first Articles.

Nor can it be said that there was no interference, simply because the interpretation in question did not exist to be interfered with. Nobody can be ignorant that there has existed all along a school of divines who have been constantly employing it, on no mean points, but such as tradition, justification, the nature and authority of the Church, &c.: some of them confessedly among the greatest names in English theology.

There was call enough for the imposers of subscription to repudiate such "suggestions," had they been so disposed. But no such thing was ever done; neither by the Church, nor (I speak under correction, not having documents at hand) by the University. May we not say then, with some confidence, that our case so far is complete? May we not hope that however the cause, which seems to us Catholic, may be damaged in other respects by the unworthiness of

its defenders, at least it will not be allowed to suffer from this imputation on their sincerity,—that they maintain it contrary to the known tenor of their own solemn engagements?

But all this depends on the consent, implied or express, of the party imposing the subscription. Let that be once unequivocally withdrawn, and we should indeed be liable to the taunts and reproaches which now affect us so little, were we to go on subscribing by virtue of our Catholic interpretation. I would not willingly excite unnecessary scruples, nor cast a stumbling-block in the way of any man's conscience; but is it not so, that had Convocation ratified any thing equivalent to the recent vote of the Heads of Houses, not only tutors, holding the Catholic view of the Articles, must have resigned their offices to avoid breach of trust, but no academic whatever, of the like principles, could either subscribe afresh or continue his subscription? Obviously he could not subscribe, for he could not do so in any sense allowed by the imposers. But since most of those who subscribe the Articles in the Universities, are too young to have definite opinions on their meaning, the main import of their subscription being that they receive them on the authority of the present Church: this might be thought no very great evil in practice. Few, it may be thought, would be excluded by it; and those who did subscribe would have greater security (so this argument would suppose) for sound education. But what are those to do who have subscribed long ago

in the Catholic sense, now (by hypothesis) forbidden? Can they honestly go on availing themselves of their former signature, now that the consideration is at an end which made that signature available? Can they with clear and untroubled consciences receive the emoluments of an academical foundation, or exercise the privileges of a member of the academical senate, while deliberately breaking the condition on which only they were allowed to share in those advantages? As long as they do so, they seem virtually to continue or renew their act of adhesion to the formula: and if there would be insincerity in that act, were it now to be performed for the first time, surely to go on reaping the benefit of it amounts to a constant repetition of the insincerity.

I am not prepared to say, that under such circumstances individuals might not honestly go on, having sufficient reason to know such was the wish of the imposing body in their own particular case: but if not sin, it would approach nearly to scandal, unless they could obtain a public dispensation, express or implied, to that effect. But as to the general case, as far as I see my way in it, I own that I have no alternative: it would be equivalent to the University's adopting a new test, which if you cannot take, you can but retire from the society.

The general principles which regulate Academical subscription must of course be applicable to Clerical subscription likewise; only that all cases of consci-

ence assume a deeper and more awful interest, as they come nearer and nearer to the Most Holy Things; and any sin or scandal which may be incurred will be, *cæteris paribus*, indefinitely greater. Nor am I unmindful, believe me, of the proportionably greater peril of unworthy tampering with this branch of the subject: and it is partly from a feeling of that sort that I have preferred stating the general case, with an immediate view to the University, rather than to the Clergy. If, however, the determination of it above intimated is correct in substance, there can be no difficulty in applying it to this other and more serious relation. If a candidate for holy orders, or a clerk nominated to any dignity or cure, were distinctly warned, by the same authority which calls on him to subscribe the Articles, that the Catholic mode of interpreting them would be considered as "evading their sense," and "defeating their object;" the act of signature would evidently amount to a pledge on his part against that mode of interpretation. If, in virtue of a preceding signature, he were already exercising his ministry, his going on, without protest, to do so, after such warning, would virtually come to the same thing: it would be equivalent, as I said before, to a continued signature; unless indeed he could obtain from the imposers express or implied dispensation for his own case, which would remove the sin, and, if made public, would remove the scandal also.

But Clerical Subscription differs from Academical in this important respect: that it is not quite so easy

to determine who are the real imposers of it, and what kind of declaration on their part is to be regarded as authoritative. Thus far, however, all Catholics will be agreed: that a synodical determination of the Bishops of the Church of England, with or without the superadded warrant of the State, (on whose prerogative in such causes I would refrain from here expressing any opinion,) would be endued with unquestionable authority. And it may seem at first sight as if nothing less could be so; as if the supposed limitation of meaning could only be enacted by another synod of London: just as in the university it would require an act of the *Senatus Academicus*. But would it not be dangerous, under present circumstances, to press this rule very rigidly?—to insist on the literal meaning of the phrase, *animus imponentis*, so as to demand that the party modifying, should be formally as well as substantially identical with the party enacting? Would it not be taking unfair advantage of the unhappy condition of our Church, and of the real or supposed inability even of her Prelates to legislate for her, independently of those who happen to be ministers of state for the time? It certainly seems as if, to a person really reverencing the Bishops as the Apostles' successors, there might be declarations of opinion not synodical, which would oblige him morally if not legally: as for example, if all our prelates should severally declare, *ex Cathedra*, their adhesion to the view which has just been expressed

at Oxford; or if not all, yet such a majority, as to leave no reasonable doubt what the decision of a synod would be. In such case, would it not be incumbent on those who abide by the Catholic exposition, yet wished to retain their ministry, to protest in some such way, as that the very silence of our Bishops permitting them to go on, would amount to a virtual dispensation as regarded them? More especially if the Bishop under whom we ourselves minister, did in any manner lay on us his commands to the same effect: (as a public, official declaration of his opinion would amount to a virtual command, and ought, I imagine, to be obeyed as such:) these are considerations which would make our position a very delicate one indeed.

First, the old sacred maxim, *He that heareth you, heareth Me*, or, as the Church afterwards expressed it, *Ecclesia in Episcopo*, could not but weigh heavily on a consistent churchman's mind: receiving as it does in our days (if possible) additional point and force from the fact, that our own Bishop's personal direction is almost the only mode left, by which we may ascertain the mind of the Church on any doubtful matter of practice [1].

Next, let it be well weighed how much the Oath of Canonical Obedience imports. No pledge can be more

[1] We have no councils, no churches in communion with us, no such assemblies of ecclesiastical doctors and teachers, as were supplied by monasteries, universities, or colleges, from the fourth century downwards.

solemn or direct, than that under which we stand bound "reverently to obey our Ordinary, and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over us; following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and *submitting ourselves to their godly judgments*." This latter clause appears to refer, more especially, to doctrinal decisions: and if to any, surely most especially to their explanation of the terms of the engagement, to which they themselves admitted us: as the Church's agents, it is true, and not in any wise by their own independent authority; yet as deliberative, responsible, highly trusted agents, endowed severally with powers of more than human origin, to enforce their "godly judgments." So that it would be a very strong step indeed, and one hardly conceivable, but in a case where the very foundation of the faith was unequivocally assailed, for a Catholic Priest to go on ministering, when he knew that he was violating the conditions on which his Bishop would allow him to minister. It would be far different from insubordinate conduct here and there, in points of detail: rather his whole clerical life would be one continued act of disobedience. Who could endure such a burthen? What labour could prosper, what blessing be looked for, under it?

It is very possible that I may overlook something which materially affects this question, and which may be plain enough to other persons; but it does seem to me that in the case supposed, (of a public censure, and dispensation refused,) loyalty to the Church, her

Creed and her Order both, could only be maintained by one of the two following courses: either we should continue in our ministry, respectfully stating our case, and making appeal to the Metropolitan, or as Archbishop Cranmer did, to the Synod, and that publicly—which course one should be slow to adopt, except in a matter which concerned the very principles of Faith and of Church Communion;—or else we should tender to our superiors our relinquishment of the post which we held under them in the Church, and retire either into some other diocese, or, if all our Bishops were agreed, into lay communion. The objections in point of scandal to these two courses would be, that the former might sound under present circumstances more as a way of talking than any thing else: the latter, unless the case were very amply and openly explained, would appear as if one conceded the notion of the Articles being incapable of a Catholic sense. But explanations might be given. And it seems on the whole that with the exception of such extreme cases as I just now put, of positive heresy in one of the Most Sacred Order, this resource of lay communion, painful and trying as it must be in most cases, both in a temporal and spiritual sense, would be the only one properly open to us. Farther than it we could not even appear to separate from that which we believe to be the manifestation of the Holy Catholic Church in our country. We might be excommunicated, but we could neither join ourselves to any of the uncatholic communities around us, nor form a new communion

for ourselves. We could not be driven into schism against our will. We could only wait patiently at the Church door, wishing and praying that our bonds might be taken off, and pleading our cause as we best might from reason and Scripture and Church precedents. So little ground is there for the surmise, that advocating the Catholic sense of the Articles is symptomatic of a tendency to depart from the English Church.

So far, my dear Friend, you will perceive that I have been addressing myself to those chiefly, who concur with me in their view of the principle on which the Articles should be expounded. May I, in conclusion, mention a few topics, which I would fain suggest for the consideration of persons demurring to that principle, either its truth or its expediency, yet unprepared to adopt, at all hazards, extreme measures towards the maintainers of it? The objects of such a censure as that which occasioned these remarks could not indeed consistently deviate into schism: but it cannot be denied, that should it be unhappily adopted by Church authority, now or at any future time, very evil consequences of that kind may be anticipated with regard to others. The whole position of our English Church, in her great controversy with Rome, will be altered. She will no longer be able to take her stand, in questions of Church practice or interpretation of Scripture, upon the old Catholic fathers and ancient doctors. To what her

appeal must be made, is not so clear; but as often as she tries to fall back on antiquity and Church consent, Romanists will have to say, "Nay, you have explicitly condemned suggestions of that kind in the exposition of your Articles; you cannot now be allowed, as in former days, to avail yourselves of them." Hitherto, in all essential points, the followers of antiquity among us have challenged the Roman Catholics to prove our formularies wrong: it has been constantly said, "Rome must move towards us in the first instance, if ever a re-union is to take place." But now it will be quite obvious, that we too shall have to retrace our steps. We shall have wantonly sacrificed so much of the holy ground, which, by an especial Providence, we have hitherto occupied. As we have in former days surrendered to them the name Catholic, so we should now, by a kind of fatality, be conceding the thing itself, and that at the very point of time when people gradually are beginning to be aware of its importance. There is no need to enlarge on the scandal which this would cause to our English Romanists, encouraging them to continue in their schism; and to Roman Catholics abroad, causing them to think and speak more harshly than ever of our branch of the Church: nor is there occasion to add any thing to the important and unanswerable statements of Mr. Newman, concerning the almost certain effect on many of our own communion, whose Catholic feelings are stronger than their principles are clear and consistent; who

are of themselves sufficiently inclined to be jealous of the signification of our formularies, from circumstances unhappily connected with their origin and history; and who may seem to be wanting only such an impulse, as a false step on the part of our Church would give them, to go sheer over the precipice, and pledge themselves to the infallibility of Rome. But may it not be well to give a thought also to another sort of scandal--the encouragement which would be given to the latitudinarian and dissenter, who will sneeringly congratulate our Church on having at last found out her own inconsistency, and abandoned the untenable position for which she has so long been contending? Will it be pleasant or profitable to have the good faith of former ages, the theological honesty of such as Andrewes and Laud, of Hammond and Bull, virtually impugned by the confession of their own branch of the Church? Will it not tend fearfully to the promotion of scepticism, and of a worldly contemptuous tone on all such subjects?

Again, it should not be left out of sight, that the course which I am now deprecating, tending to displace, on religious scruples, a certain number of clergymen or academical men, tends, consequently, to perplex and discourage a certain number of quiet, thoughtful people, under their charge, or otherwise aware of the circumstances. Of course, this inconvenience must be faced, rather than bear with false doctrine or immoral practice: yet it is a serious

thing to multiply cases of conscience, and disseminate popular alarms, without some great necessity; and those who think the interpretation objected to rather imprudently stated than untrue in itself, will perhaps feel themselves bound, according to their opportunities, to check the same kind of imprudence, should it appear on the opposite side, the more earnestly from their sympathising with such simple people as I am now alluding to.

Further, we may be tolerably sure that the half schismatical effect of such a censure will not pass away with this year nor with the next, nor with the lives of those who have to inflict or endure it. There will always be, in all probability, a certain number of educated persons, who will be led to take the view now objected to of the Articles of the English Church, and will be unable to sign them in any other sense. They will be restrained, at most, to Lay Communion, and their energies will be so much lost to the ministry. And it will be much if in course of years human infirmity do not cause some of them to lapse into absolute schism. At any rate they will be a constant though an involuntary thorn in our Church's side: in one respect more so even than the Nonjurors; at least so far as the point which gave name to their party went; for they naturally ceased as a sect or school, when the claims of the exiled family vanished away. But the interpretation which causes this difference, is such as cannot well

cease to exist, while men have eyes to read the Fathers and to compare them with the Articles, and hearts to feel the duty of Catholicity.

The last evil that I shall now specify, as likely to ensue from any hasty step of the kind on the part of those in authority, is the necessity which it seems to involve of something more definite, to follow on the Protestant side of the controversy. (I use the word Protestant in its historical sense, that sense by which it is best known throughout Christendom, as denoting a certain school of positive opinions: not in its strict etymological sense, as simply meaning those who protest against certain errors of the Church of Rome.) For example: the censure, supposing it authoritative, declares it an evasion of the sense of our Church on Purgatory, to say that "the Romish doctrine" means the doctrine of the Schools as popularly taught in that communion: will it not be expected, by and by, that the same authority should declare what *is* the intended measure of Romish doctrine? May we not expect efforts to establish, as a *dictum* of our Church, the too popular notion, that wilful deadly sin after Baptism, truly repented of, is as if it had never been; instead of only having a reasonable hope, more or less, of forgiveness when it shall please God? Again, the censure seems to repudiate Catholic consent as a part of the Rule of Faith: shall we have no endeavours, by and by, to assert in direct terms the right of private judgment in its place? The

same kind of questions might be asked with reference to the other disputed points; nor would it be hard to imagine two or three different schools of Theology, which would earnestly contend with each other for the right of determining them, each encouraged by the success they had had in common in first setting out. There is here abundant promise of future controversy; considering that the object of the censure was the peace of the Church.

But we may be allowed to hope better things: and, indeed, whilst I am writing, I am informed that the respected authors of this severe but no doubt conscientious sentence, have given, or are giving currency to a statement, that they did not intend it as an expression of theological opinion, but rather, if I rightly understand what I hear, as a caution against an immoral unfairness of interpretation, which they feared might find unintentional encouragement in the manner of reasoning adopted in the Tract which they were noticing. You and others will judge whether any thing has been said incidentally, in the course of this letter, to obviate any such suspicion, by explaining that the principle of the Tract was that which the first imposers of subscription expressly recommended, and which their successors in every generation have constantly allowed: viz. to interpret all doubtful places, as nearly as possible, by the rule of Catholic consent. You will also judge whether I have at all succeeded in the more direct

object of what has been said: in pointing out, namely, the course which persons interpreting our formularies on the abovementioned Catholic principle must adopt, in the event of an authoritative condemnation of that principle: you will judge whether the principle itself, or the condemnation of it, is more to be apprehended, as tending either to schism, or to scandal in other ways. And whatever your sentence may be on these points, you will, I am sure, rejoice with me, that through the moderation of various parties, the discussion, at first so painful, appears likely to be concluded with no loss to truth, and (may I not add?) with some gain to charity: (for I reckon as nothing what may have been said in angry newspapers, or in mere political declamation:) and that we have heard so little, during its progress, of that most uncatholic sentiment, too often lightly uttered in such debates, "If a man cannot sign, let him go: we can do without him: if he does not like our Church, let him go to another:" as if there were any other to which he could go. The prevalence or abatement of this sort of language and feeling, is perhaps one of the surest *indices* of the decay or growth of the temper of Catholicity among us. May we hear and practise less and less of it, and more of the tone and mind of that good Bishop of our Church, who living in uncatholic times, yet made it part of his daily evening prayer, that GOD would "vouchsafe unto him an interest in the prayers of His holy Church THROUGHOUT THE

WORLD, which had that day been offered to the Throne of Grace."

Believe me, my dear Friend,

Very affectionately yours,

J. KEBLE.

Hursley, April 2, 1841.

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

Ev: Ph: Sh:

A

VINDICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES

OF

THE AUTHORS

OF

"THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."

A

VINDICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES

OF

THE AUTHORS

OF

"THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."

BY THE

HON. & REV. A. P. PERCEVAL, B.C.L.

FORMERLY OF ORIEL,

NOW OF ALL SOULS' COLLEGE, OXFORD.

"Refrain not to speak when there is occasion to do good."
ECCLUS. iv. 23.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1841.

LONDON:
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

TO

THE FRIENDS OF TRUTH AND PEACE,

I BEG LEAVE

AFFECTIONATELY TO DEDICATE

THESE PAGES.

East Horsley,
March 28, 1841.

A

VINDICATION,

&c.

AMID the popular clamour directed against those connected with the "Tracts for the Times," it is hardly to be expected that a calm voice of appeal, proceeding from one of that body, will be allowed a patient hearing. Yet it seems right that such an appeal should be made, as well on account of all concerned on either side, as on account of the truth itself, for the security and defence of which, according to the best of their present judgment and belief, both the accused and their accusers have acted.

The crime laid to our charge is this, that we pay, and teach others to pay, a deference to the voice of the ancient Church, contrary to the principles of the Reformation, and inconsistent with our office as ministers of the Church of England.

Whether this be so or no, cannot be determined without a clear understanding both of our principles,

and of those of the Reformation on this head: on both which points much misunderstanding seems to prevail. For we are accused of placing the traditions of the primitive Church, as set forth in the writings of the divines of those times, on a footing of authority superior to that which we allow to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. I can only say, that I know of no writer in the English Communion who has attempted that, save one, and he most unintentionally, but that writer is no favourer of the Tracts, but one of their foremost opposers—I mean the late Warden of New College, Dr. Shuttleworth, who in his book entitled, "Not Tradition, but Scripture," has involved himself in the very fault, which, without sufficient consideration, he had charged against us. He has set himself to overturn a scriptural truth, declared, or alleged to be declared, in sundry places of the inspired writings of St. Paul [1], not by a critical examination of the texts alleged, or by a more extensive collation of other passages of Holy Writ, comparing spiritual things with spiritual, but by the sole force of the ecclesiastical tradition of Irenæus, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Justin Martyr. I have yet to learn that any one of the writers of the Tracts has followed his example.

These, I believe to be the principles common to

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 2. 2 Thess. ii. 15. ibid. iii. 6. 1 Tim. i. 3. 15. 18. ii. 11. iii. 1. iv. 9, 10. vi. 14. 20. 2 Tim. i. 14. ii. 2.

all who have been connected with the Tracts: if any one among them entertain others, I am wholly unconscious of the fact:

1. We believe that, by the over-ruling Providence of God, it hath been so ordered, that Holy Scripture does contain all things necessary for men either to believe or do in order to salvation.

2. We believe that He who has given us the Scriptures, has also, for the more effectually guarding the sacred truths to which they witness, provided assistance in the testimony of the Church from the beginning, as exhibited in the writings of the ancient Christians, wonderfully preserved and handed down: which testimony men are not at liberty to lay aside.

Hence we hold, that, in things necessary to salvation, whatever may be gathered from the Scriptures, and has been confirmed by the Church from the beginning, as necessary to be received or rejected; that every Christian is bound to receive or reject accordingly: but that no Christian man is to be urged to receive, as necessary to salvation, any apparent deductions from the text of Holy Writ, unless confirmed by the ancient Church: nor positions (if any such exist), maintained by the ancient Church, as necessary, without Scripture warrant. In things not necessary to salvation, we hold that the opinions and practices of the saints and martyrs of old, which have not been condemned in the Church, have a claim upon our reverence; and that that claim is increased in proportion as the testimony of the

ecclesiastical records affords ground for believing that they were received and observed from the beginning. But, at the same time, we hold that, in all matters of this kind, the rulers of the Church for the time being have authority to forbid or enjoin the observance of any such practices, to allow or to restrain the promulgation of such opinions, as they shall deem to tend most to edification.

Now, are these principles, or are they not, contrary to the principles of the Reformers, or in any respect forbidden by the Church of England? How shall we ascertain the principles of the Reformers? Shall it be by the expression of their individual opinions? Let us hear, then, Cranmer speaking:

"I protest that it was never in my mind to write, speak, or understand anything contrary to the most holy Word of God, or else against *the holy Catholic Church of Christ*, but purely and simply to imitate and teach *those things only* which I had learned of the Sacred Scripture, *and of the Catholic Church of Christ* from the beginning, and also *according to the exposition of the most holy and learned fathers and martyrs of the Church.* And if any thing, peradventure, hath chanced otherwise than I thought, I may err; but heretic I cannot be, forasmuch as I am ready *in all things* to follow the judgment of the most sacred Word of God, *and of the holy Catholic Church.*" —*Appeal to a General Council.*

Ridley speaks thus: "When I perceive the greatest part of Christianity to be infected with the poison

of the See of Rome, I repair to the usage *of the primitive Church.*"

Farrar, Hooper, Taylor, Philpot, Bradford, and Coverdale, speak thus: "We doubt not, by God's grace, but we shall be able to *prove* all our confession here to be *most true, by* the verity of God's word, *and consent of the Catholic Church.*"—*Confession at Oxford*, 1554.

Philpot still more plainly speaks thus, at his fourth examination:—"The Bishop of Gloucester asked him, "I pray you, by whom will you be judged in matters of controversy which happen daily?" Philpot answered, "By the Word of God, for Christ saith in St. John, the Word that He spake shall be judge in the latter day." The Bishop then asked him, "What if you take the Word one way, and I another way, who shall judge then?" Mark Philpot's answer: "THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH."

If the case, then, were to be decided by an appeal to the individual Reformers, it is clear that a judgment of acquittal must needs be pronounced: it thus appearing, that the appeal to the ancient Catholic Church, conjointly with, though subordinate to, the Scriptures, was maintained and practised by all the most eminent of those persons, who shed their blood to deliver us from Papal bondage, and from the corruption of Christian doctrines which were and are cherished by the See of Rome.

But it may be said, and truly, the individual opinions of men, however eminent, cannot set aside the

judgment of the Church to which they belong; and however much the Reformers whom you have quoted may have countenanced and approved, as individuals, the principles you have been maintaining, still, if the Church of England itself has decided contrary to them, you are still open to condemnation: we require, therefore, the decision of the Church itself upon this matter. I will not reply, as I might, that it is for our accusers to produce a decision of the Church depriving us of the liberty to maintain the principles I have stated: because I am prepared to contend, that, in maintaining these principles, we are not only not acting contrary to the decision of the Church, but are simply obeying the directions which she has given us. I, therefore, can have no reluctance to comply with the supposed demand of our accusers, how unreasonable soever it may be. I proceed, therefore, to quote the decision of the Church of England in the time of the Reformation upon the very point in dispute: the decision of the Bishops and Divines who adorned our Churches when she arose from the ashes of Queen Mary's fires: a decision pronounced in open synod, and propounded to the Clergy of the Church of England, and which, as it has never since been repealed or annulled, continues still to have force upon them. It was decreed in the Convocation of 1571, assembled under Archbishop Parker, and ratified by him: and I would suggest to those zealous individuals, who, out of respect to his memory, are collecting what

they are pleased to call the "Parker Library," to which I am a subscriber, that they would do well to place this decree in the title-page of every volume of their series: and to admit none into their Library, the contents of which are not in accordance with it. The decree is entitled, *De Concionatoribus*, and contains rules for the guidance of all preachers in the Church of England. The words which concern the point in dispute are as follows: "In the first place, they (the preachers) shall see that they *never teach any thing* for a discourse, which they wish *to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament,* AND WHAT THE CATHOLIC FATHERS AND ANCIENT BISHOPS *have collected out of that same doctrine.*"

Nor is it only in the Canons of 1571 that we find this principle thus explicitly maintained; in the Canons of 1603, which are in every one's hands, and the last which our Church has been allowed her liberty to frame and receive, the same principle is repeatedly recognised. Thus in Canon 30: "We, following the royal steps of our most worthy king, because he therein followeth the rules of the Scripture *and the practice of the Primitive Church*, do commend to all the true members of the Church of England these our directions and observations following." "The use of the sign of the Cross was held *by the Primitive Church*, as well by the Greeks as the Latins, with one consent and applause," "*following therein the primitive and Apostolical Churches:*"

"those true rules of doctrine concerning things indifferent, which are consonant to the Word of God, *and the judgment of the ancient Fathers.*" Canon 31: "Forasmuch *as the ancient Fathers of the Church*, led by example of the Apostles, appointed prayers and fasts to be used at the solemn ordering of Ministers, ... *we following their holy and religious example*, do constitute. Canon 32: "The office of Deacon being a step or degree to the Ministry, *according to the judgment of the ancient Fathers, and the practice of the primitive Church*, we do ordain, &c." Canon 33: "It hath been long since *provided by many decrees of the ancient Fathers*, that none should be admitted either Deacon or Priest, who had not some certain place where he might use his function. According to which example we do ordain," &c.

It appears, then, that both in matters of doctrine and discipline, it has ever been the avowed intention of the Church of England to seek guidance and direction from the ancient Church, and not from the Scriptures only: that her Reformation was based on this very principle, and the use of it enjoined to all her ministers, who are cautioned against trusting to their own private judgments in gathering doctrine for the instruction of their people from the sacred text, and directed to correct their private judgment by "the catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops."

If more proof is wanted, I can adduce it in abundance, by citing the Book of Homilies, prepared by the Reformers in the reigns of Edward VI. and

Queen Elizabeth, for the instruction of all classes of the people; recommended by our Articles to this day as fit for that purpose; and to a general approval of which, every member of the university of Oxford, every graduate of Cambridge, and every bishop, priest, and deacon in the Church of England, is pledged by the subscription of his own hand. If there be one feature throughout the whole of the Homilies more remarkable than another, it is the exhibition of that very principle of deference to the ancient Church, for the maintenance of which so much reproach has been heaped upon our heads. In this moderately-sized volume of sermons we find Ambrose, and Anselm, and Athanasius, and Arnobius, and Augustine, and Basil, and Bede, and Bernard, and Boniface, and Chrysostom, and Clemens, and Cyprian, and Cyril, and Damascene, and Dionysius, and Epiphanius, and Eusebius, and Eusebius of Emissa, and Eutropius, and Fulgentius, and Gregory, and Hilary, and Ignatius, and Irenæus, and Jerome, and Isidore, and Justin, and Lactantius, and Origen, and Œcumenius, and Optatus, and Prosper, and Paulus Diaconus, and Photius, and Serenus, and Theophylact, and Tertullian, and Zephyrus, and Zephyrinus, and others, quoted with a frequency of which we have no parallel in these times. I have noted forty citations from Augustine only. The terms in which they are spoken of are no less remarkable than the frequency of the citations. "The great clerk and godly preacher;" "the learned and godly doctor;"

"a godly father;" "the holy fathers and doctors;" and expressions of the same kind, meet us at every turn. Nor is this all: they are cited as persons, to whose testimony, judgment, and decision, the very greatest deference is due:—"St. Augustine, a doctor of great authority and also antiquity, hath this opinion:" "You see that the authority both of the Scripture and also of Augustine;" "It is already proved, both by the Scriptures and by the authority of Augustine;" "To know which they be, St. Augustine teacheth us;" "Ye have heard how earnestly both the apostles, prophets, holy fathers, and doctors, do exhort us;" "If the wholesome counsel of godly fathers or the love of Christ may move us;" "Being warned by his holy Word, and by the writings of old godly doctors and ecclesiastical histories;" and so throughout. The appeal for the truth of Christian doctrine is uniformly made, not to the Scriptures only, but to the Scriptures corroborated by the Fathers; of which I will add only one more instance,—that, namely, in which we are instructed how to ascertain the truth concerning the celebration of the Lord's supper. "But, *before all other things*, this we must be sure of *especially*, that this supper be in such wise done and ministered, as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done, as his holy Apostles used it, and *the good fathers of the primitive Church frequented it*."

We may safely ask, in what instance have the writers of the Tracts required greater deference to be

paid to the Fathers, than the whole Church of England is here taught to pay in the very Homilies provided by the Reformers? Nor will it avail any to say, when pressed by these arguments, that indeed they must admit that the primitive Church has some claim upon our attention; but that they understand by that term only the Church of the first two or three centuries; whereas we receive it much more largely. For, if they will consult the Homilies, they will find the Reformers instructing the clergy to teach the people, as *beyond all doubt*, that for almost 700 years the Church was most pure, and that the six general councils held during that time were allowed and received of all men.

As far, then, as our principles are concerned, I think we need no longer fear reproach from any from whom it would be painful to receive it. But then comes the question of the application of those principles, in all the various points of detail which have been mooted in the Tracts. It will be said, however unexceptionable the principles you maintain may be, still you must admit it to be possible that you may have erred in the application of them. I not only admit it to be at once both possible and probable, but can have no hesitation in repeating what I have already felt myself under the painful necessity of publishing to the world, that, as far as my own judgment enables me to speak, this misapplication has taken effect in more than one instance. So far as this: that some of the writers of the Tracts,

not content with claiming to themselves and exercising that liberty which the Church of England has allowed her children, of entertaining and cherishing any of the pious opinions or practices which obtained in the ancient Church, and which she has not felt it necessary to forbid, have urged those opinions and practices upon others as things which *ought* to be held; thus seemingly invading in others that liberty which they so justly prize for themselves. But then I submit to the judgment of all impartial men, that the misapplication of principles, by individuals holding them, affords no just ground for reproaching the principles themselves, nor the body in general who hold those principles, and do not concur in the (supposed) misapplication of them. Nor do I believe that any considerate persons would have thought that there was any cause for such reproach in the present instance, if it had not been for the anonymous way in which the Tracts have been issued: a mistaken course, I must needs think, but concerning which I will do no more, than express, thus publicly, my earnest hope, that it may henceforth be discontinued.

With respect to the Tract 90, I must confess that I do not see how any member of the Church of England can be blamed for doing what Mr. Newman has there attempted to do, namely, to give to the Articles of the Church of England that interpretation which shall render them most in accordance with that principle of deference to the primitive Church of

the first seven centuries, which, in subordination to the Scriptures, the Church has laid down for the standard of teaching to be observed by all the clergy. It seems to me, that for any member of the Church of England to go about to condemn opinions and practices received and approved in those ages of the Church, which the Reformers counted "most pure," and by "those godly Fathers," to whose instructions our rules direct us to have recourse; and without whose approval Cranmer desired to teach nothing; is neither more nor less than to fly in the face of the Reformers, to cast aside the very fundamental principles of the English Reformation, and to violate the express rules of the Church. If in any instances it can be shown that the strict letter of the Articles is necessarily and absolutely condemnatory of any such opinions and practices, we are bound, in charity to the Reformers, to suppose that this was most unintentional on their parts, and for ourselves must confess that we are placed in a situation of very perplexing difficulty: from which, whether the best way would be to do violence to their Articles for the integrity of their principles, or to do violence to their principles for the sake of abiding by what one must needs consider a mere oversight or error on their part in framing the Articles, is so nice a point of casuistry, that I will say no more than that I see not why a man should be blamed who thinks the latter the greater evil of the two.

But this being so, is it not, I would ask, an act of

piety towards the Reformers, and of charity and duty to the whole Church of England, more especially to all who are required to subscribe the Articles, to endeavour to show that the Reformers have been guilty of no such inconsistency, and that we are under no necessity of making so difficult a choice? This, as the whole Tract declares, is all that Mr. Newman has attempted. In whatever instances he has succeeded, he deserves the thanks of every one who reveres the memory of the Reformers, or values the character of the Church of England. In whatever instances men shall succeed in showing that this cannot be done, they will only have the unenviable satisfaction of proving that the Reformers were inconsistent, and ourselves involved in difficulty.

This being my present view of the subject, there can be no need for me to enter into the details of the Tract. There are many things in it which I do not understand: some which I disapprove, perhaps from not understanding them: some statements advanced, which I think cannot be maintained: some conclusions drawn, which seem unwarranted by the premises. But as to the main object aimed at by the Tract, I must repeat that I think it deserves the commendation of every member of the Church of England.

I own, at the first I doubted very much whether the time for the promulgation of it was well chosen; but I know not how even this objection can, upon consideration, be maintained: for, seeing we are every day apparently drawing into closer contest with those

who uphold the Roman corruptions, it must needs be of great moment for those who are to engage on our side to know, more distinctly than seems generally understood, what those points are which we are under actual obligation to maintain against them: and not leave them under the dangerous impression of having to prove the condemnation of things which the Church of England never did condemn, and which she could not have condemned without violation of those great principles on which our Reformation was founded; but which, from the slip-slop way in which the Articles seem of late to have been received, many individuals have thought themselves under the necessity of at least attempting to condemn. The cause of truth itself, and of charity, both towards our own members, and those of the other side, not only justified, but required such an undertaking.

It seems to me, that the commander of a city, who, upon the approach of an enemy's besieging army, levels the citizens' boxes, which in time of peace they had built around it, lest the enemy should effect a lodgment by means of them, and the strength of the garrison be wasted in vain attempts to defend untenable positions, might with as much reason be accused of treason, as we, who, precisely upon the same principles, have ventured to reject those fanciful additions to the Articles of the Church of England, which were not contemplated by her Reformers, and can serve no other purpose but that of embarrassing her defenders, if attempted to be maintained against the keen assailants with whom we have to do.

Before quitting the Tract, it may perhaps be expected that I should state whether I justify what Mr. Sewell, in his letter to Dr. Pusey, p. 4, calls "the disparaging language in which the Articles appear to be spoken of—the representation of them as a bondage, rather than a safeguard." I answer that, for my own part, I must needs regard them in both lights—at once a safeguard and a bondage. That they have upon the whole acted as a most important safeguard, I would freely own: but I see not how it is possible to deny that they are a bondage, and a heavy one. At least, if a barrier to the entrance to the Christian priesthood, unknown to the Church for fifteen centuries and a half, and (unless I am mistaken) excluding from clerical communion the whole of the rest of Christendom, be not a bondage, I know not what the meaning of that term is. Let it not be supposed that I use these as words of censure: desperate diseases require desperate remedies. Situated as our Reformers were, I am not prepared to contend that they could have done better: in the body ecclesiastic as well as politic it may be often necessary to purchase safety by surrendering somewhat of liberty; and I am far from denying that the advantages of the safeguard furnished by the Articles, may have far outweighed the disadvantage of their bondage: but this at least must be said of them, that they were witnesses, by their institution, of the evil of the days which rendered their institution apparently necessary; and so long as they are necessarily continued, are witnesses of the continu-

ance of the same. The bondage, I conceive, would be undeniable, even were the strict meaning of the Articles more obvious than it is; but it is much increased by their being, in some instances, expressed in terms which at first seem contrary to the truth, and require to be very carefully and strictly weighed, before they can be reconciled to it. I will point out two instances of this, which I the rather do, because I hope to afford a more satisfactory solution of the difficulties which they present, than that which Mr. Newman has suggested.

The first is in Article 6, where, in explanation of the term Holy Scripture, it is said, "In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." I confess that when, in pursuing my theological studies, I found that there had been for a long time in the Church very great doubts as to the authority of some of the books in our New Testament, I was perfectly staggered. Nor did the solution which some of the commentators have suggested, and which Mr. Newman has adopted, afford any satisfaction to my mind. His exposition is as follows: "Here it is not meant that there never was any doubt in *portions* of the Church or *particular* Churches concerning certain books, which the Article includes in the Canon; for some of them, as, for instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, have been the subject of much doubt in the West or East, as the case may be. But the Article asserts

that there has been no doubt about them in the Church catholic; that is, at the very first time that the catholic or whole Church had the opportunity of forming a judgment on the subject, it pronounced in favour of the canonical books. The Epistle to the Hebrews was doubted by the West, and the Apocalypse by the East, only while those portions of the Church investigated separately from each other, only till they compared notes, interchanged sentiments, and formed a united judgment. The phrase must mean this, because, from the nature of the case, it can mean nothing else." I say that this solution affords no satisfaction to my mind, because, though I believe it to be true as concerns the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, the 2d of St. Peter, and 2d and 3d of St. John, that the doubt concerning them was yielded at once upon some such interchange of sentiment as is here spoken of, and lasted so short a time as hardly to deserve notice: yet, in respect to the Hebrews and Revelations, I see not how the allegations on which the solution rests can be maintained. For first, it was not only in the East that the Revelations was doubted of, the first person recorded as impugning it, being Caius, a Roman presbyter; and next, it seems strange to assert, that it was for want of conference between the East and West that the doubt continued, seeing that the doubt continued during the whole of the fourth century, during which the general councils of Nice and Constantinople were held, and constant intercourse was kept up between the East and West.

3dly, the Article does not say "*by* the Church," which this solution seems to require, but "*in* the Church." How then is the difficulty to be avoided? Simply by taking the sentence in the very strictest sense of its words, affirmative but not exclusive. The sentence does not say, as it seems at first to mean, we receive these and no others; but simply affirms we do receive these: *i. e.* as if it should have said, "In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand (in the first place), those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church:" which is perfectly consistent with stating, when it comes to treat of the New Testament, that, as regards it, all the books *commonly* received are to be received and accounted canonical.

The other instance I would name, occurs in the 21st Article; where it is affirmed, "General councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes." On which Mr. Newman remarks, "That great bodies of men of different countries may not meet together without the sanction of their rulers, is plain from the principles of civil obedience, and from primitive practice." He receives the affirmation according to its first and most obvious meaning, namely, as asserting a principle, and finds no difficulty in admitting it, assuming that the bodies of men must be "great," and assembled from "different countries." But the bodies assembled need not be great; for one representative from each national Church, might, if the Church were

willing, suffice for a general council; and, at that rate, even with Christianity as it is, the number would not be great: and again, the Church, before our Saviour's return, may, even yet, be reduced to one country: and its bishops be reduced to so few, that even a score or a dozen of the inhabitants of the same country might constitute a general council in the fullest sense of the words: yet, even these, if the Article is to be received as affirming a principle, must not meet together to consult for the preservation of the Church, without the command of the prince, who might be a heathen, rejoicing in the prospect of its extinction. I confess, if it were necessary to understand the Article in this sense, I durst not affirm it to be true, but must needs consider it profane and impious, and anti-Christian. For if the principle be true, it must needs apply to provincial councils, as well as to general ones, and then all the councils held by the Christians before the conversion of Constantine, not one of which was assembled at the command of a prince, must be condemned as wicked. This is fearful enough; but when it is considered that the first general council upon record, the only one truly so called, was that of the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem; this also, seeing it had no prince's command to allege, must fall under the same condemnation. How, then, is the difficulty to be avoided? Simply by abiding by the strict letter of the Article, and closely weighing the words employed in it; when we discover that the word "may," had in the sixteenth century a force which is now obsolete,

expressive not of right but of power: consequently that the Article does not assert a principle, but merely affirms a fact: not meaning to say that councils *ought* not to assemble without the will of princes, but merely that they *cannot;* which of course is true, the civil power having force to prevent them if it should think fit.

Now I think it probable that many will think this merely another instance of that evasion which they have so liberally charged upon Mr. Newman; and, certainly, if we had only the English words to deal with, it would not be in my power to do more than show that such a meaning was possible. Happily, however, the Latin comes to my aid, and declares that it is the actual meaning which the framers of the Articles intended to express: "Generalia concilia sine jussu et voluntate principum congregari *non possunt.*" Had the framers of the Articles intended to affirm a principle, it appears from a comparison of many of the Articles (20, 23, 26, 32, and others) that the term used would probably have been "*non licet.*" Perhaps this instance may lead some people to think that there is some danger in hasty judgment.

In conclusion, I think I owe it to myself to declare, that in making with my friends the united effort in defence of the Church, from whence the publication of the "Tracts for the Times" arose [1], my

[1] The friends to whom I allude are, the Rev. R. H. Froude (since dead), the Rev. J. Keble, the Rev. J. H. Newman, and another. The time, when the effort spoken of was agreed by us to be made, was in 1833. The occasion of making it arose from

sole object was simply to defend those fundamental principles upon which the primitive and catholic Church rested for seven hundred years; upon which the Reformers of our Church professed to effect her cleansing; and which they have consigned to us for our direction; by which only (I believe) can Catholic Truth be defended, and Christian Liberty secured, and the ultimate restoration of the whole Church to one communion be ever brought about: but which, through some strange laxity of education, to the infinite hazard of our Church and our religion, had become confounded in men's minds with those very corruptions, against which, as well as against the still more fearful dangers in a contrary direction, they afford, under the Divine Blessing, the only reasonable and intelligible safeguard.

the violence at that time perpetrated in part (*e. g.* in the destruction of the Ten Bishoprics), and still more fearfully threatened (in the proposed Parliamentary alterations of the Liturgy), not merely against the constitutional privileges of the clergy, as one of the estates of the realm, but against the fundamental principles of the religion which we profess as members of the Church of Christ. The two principles, which, with all their just and legitimate consequences, formed the written and acknowledged basis of our united effort, were simply these: a firm maintenance of the Apostolical Succession; and a resolution to preserve the integrity of Christian doctrine in our Prayer Book. The whole of the communications which I received from my friends upon the subject will be found in the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, No. 7.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE writing the above, I have seen Mr. Newman's letter to Dr. Jelf, in which there are two points which I feel that I ought not to pass unnoticed. I cannot read without remonstrance what he says concerning the Church of Rome, namely, that "She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings, which may be especially called catholic:" nor do otherwise than express my surprise at the (apparently) strange inconsistency of his ascribing this to the Church of Rome, when that Church is involved (in all, or almost all, of the twelve articles of Pope Pius' Creed) in that very fault from which he has been seeking to vindicate the Articles of the Church of England, namely, in wholesale condemnation of the Church of Christ for the first seven centuries. As to the "scope for the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness," which may be, I

suppose, expressed in one word—true piety; I believe it to be utter delusion to imagine, that there is more scope for the development of them in the Church of Rome than in the Church of England. I believe that for the fullest development of them within the Church of England by every layman of her communion, no more is wanted than the moral courage to live above the world while they live in it, which must ever be required of the children of God in this world of trial. And so far am I from believing that this is more easy in the Church of Rome than in the Church of England, that, on the contrary, my firm conviction is, that it requires more moral courage in a clergyman of that Church to attain to it, than it does for a layman of our own, and that without taking into account the awful impieties in the celebration of Divine Service, of which those Clergy are guilty.

The other point to which I allude is, where he speaks of some persons as apparently contemplating either "joining the Church of Rome," or "withdrawing from the Church as established;" and that only in the language of regret, without one word of reproof. Here, again, I must speak plainly, and feel confident that I shall have his approval, when I declare my opinion to be, that, even if the Articles of the Church of England were as condemnatory of the primitive Christians as the Creed of Pope Pius is, still this would afford neither warrant nor excuse for separation from her communion, unless it were at-

tempted to force them upon all men as terms of communion, which has been done in the latter case. If persons shall succeed, as many at the present moment inconsiderately seem attempting, namely, in obliging the Clergy of the Church of England, in subscribing to her Articles, to subscribe to a condemnation of the Church of earlier and better times, the light of whose guidance and example her Reformers not only held out to the admiration of the Clergy, but instructed the Clergy in the Homilies, to hold out to the admiration of the people, then, indeed, I think many would agree with me in considering that we could no longer continue in the *ministry* of the Church; but this would afford us no ground for leaving her *communion*, so long as she did not require this as a term of communion. It seems to me, that one of Noah's sons might with equal piety and safety have thrown himself into the wild waters of the Deluge, if Noah had ordered the ark otherwise than to his mind; as members of the Church of England plunge into the waste of schism, so long as the bread of life and the cup of salvation may be obtained by them without sin in her pale, at the hands of those whom the Lord has commissioned to administer them. Let men well and deeply consider this, that, although the impious ministration of the offices of religion on the part of Nadab and Abihu was such, that God struck them dead, yet not a hair of the head perished from any one of the people of Israel, who had been, indeed, as we must

needs conclude, witnesses of the impiety, but had not in act or deed consented to it. But that when Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, taking, not improbably, perverse occasion from this, rose in rebellion against the priesthood, they, and every soul who joined himself to them, perished from the congregation of the Lord. From which we may draw two conclusions: first, that the sins of the rulers of a Church will not be imputed to or exacted of the people, unless they have by act or deed consented to them: secondly, that rebellion against those rulers has been more fearfully punished by God than any other sin. It is upon the strength of the case of Nadab and Abihu, that I have cherished and expressed the hope, (which has called forth torrents of abuse,) that if consent to the Romish errors were not implied and understood as the term of communion in that Church, a man who in Romish countries should seek Communion there, need not fear that the deprivation of the cup would be imputed to him as sin; if he himself were willing to receive the cup, and did not consent to, but merely endured, the withholding of it by the priests, who seem to me, in this matter at least, to be treading in the fearful footsteps of Nadab and Abihu. It is upon the strength of the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, that I have ever felt it my duty to take every occasion of witnessing against the guilt of separation, the doing of which has in like manner subjected me to reproach, especially from the Master of the Temple, not against me by name, but

against one of the "Tracts for the Times" which I had written: he apparently not being aware, as neither was I myself when I wrote the Tract, that in applying the case of Korah to the Dissenters who have taken upon themselves the exercise of the office of the Christian priesthood, without any ostensible commission from God, and in open defiance of the rulers of the Church, I was only doing what Wesley himself had done, when by the terror of that example he sought to deter his followers from involving themselves in such a sin.

But if, as some have dared to urge, the Church of England should follow, not in part, but wholly, the example of the Church of Rome, and both put such a construction upon her Articles as should condemn the Church of Christ in her purest days, and also urge a consent to such condemnation as a term of communion, and cast forth out of her bosom, as Rome has done, all her children who should refuse consent to such schismatical impiety, then indeed I conceive that a man would have no choice but to take his stand with Elijah, though he actually were, what Elijah only fancied himself to be, alone in the world. But God forbid that I should contemplate it, even as a possibility, that the rulers of the Church of England should ever be so far forsaken of God as to adopt either of these courses.

If there be one thing more clear than another, it is this, that the framers of the Articles of the Church of England never intended to condemn any opinion or

practice which had been generally received and unreproved in the Church of the first seven centuries; and that if in anything they have seemed to express themselves otherwise, it was most contrary to their intention, and would have been utterly repudiated by them: so that if in any Article such condemnation seems to be expressed, it is to be understood of the abuse, and not of the legitimate use, of the thing so spoken of; and that to endeavour, from the mere wording of their Articles, which they are no longer alive to explain, to fasten such a reproach upon them, is a violation of the spirit for the sake of the letter, which would not be endured in laws temporal, and therefore ought not to be urged in those which are ecclesiastical, especially when affecting liberty, as is the case with the Articles.

But whilst urging this, I must needs remark, that Mr. Newman, in his Tract 90, speaks something of a primitive doctrine of purgatory, and of image-worship. May I ask him to be more explicit, and say what the nature and extent of that doctrine was, and by whom maintained, and whether it passed unreproved in the Church? He will hardly, I think, contend that the speculation of one or two individuals on the *possibility* of purgatory, which is all that Jerome and Bede had attained to, is sufficient to constitute a primitive doctrine, especially when we have the contrary testimony of Epiphanius, that ψυχῶν κάθαρσις was one of the heretical peculiarities of Simon Magus. Nor can he venture to assert, that the worship of images

was unreproved in the primitive Church, while the writings of so many of the ancients testify in what utter detestation they held it, *colere*, or σέβειν, or προσκυνεῖν, anything of the sort. Has he forgotten that Irenæus and Epiphanius both agree in ascribing the introduction of images into Christian worship, to the Carpocratian heretics, while Eusebius regarded it as a mere heathenish custom (ἐθνικὴ συνήθεια)[1]? Or does he mean to deny to the Church of England now the liberty which she exercised in the eighth century, of condemning that which Hoveden declares to have been execrated by the whole Church of God; and which the great Council of Francfort agreed in utterly (*omnimodis*) rejecting and condemning?

As a general principle, I am sure I shall have his concurrence in this: namely, that while, on the one hand, no man needs excuse for approving any opinion or practice which was unreproved in the primitive Church; so neither does he for condemning any practice or opinion which can be shown to have been openly, and without reproof, condemned in that same Church.

[1] Eccles. Hist. vii. 18.

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

L.o: Pa: Sh:

REMARKS

ON THE

NECESSITY OF ATTEMPTING

A

RESTORATION

OF THE

NATIONAL CHURCH.

BY THE

REV. W. GRESLEY,

PREBENDARY OF LICHFIELD.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1841.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

THESE pages are respectfully inscribed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, in the hope that they will pardon the plainness with which they are written, and with the earnest request that they will bestow on them their candid consideration.

REMARKS,

&c.

A STRONG feeling exists amongst the members of the English Church—a feeling not confined to any one section, but general and urgent—that the time is come for making an effort to supply the ordinances of religion, and pastoral superintendence, to all the people in the land; and to make our Church, what it has long been only in name, a National Institution. The lamentable inadequacy of the present establishment is too painfully forced upon our notice to be denied or excused. When we see the ungodliness of our dense population, the strange forms of error which yearly spring up, the unbridled sinfulness which is rife amongst us, the masses of human beings which live and die without even the ordinances of religion—insomuch that it has become a vain boast to call ourselves a Christian people—who can contemplate these facts without shuddering? Who can think of them without at the same time reflecting with awe, *what may be his own personal share in the responsibility*

for so many souls lost, so much dishonour done to God? Even taking the lowest ground, who can shut his eyes to the danger which exists of the disruption of all our social institutions by the sudden outbreak of such ungodliness, even now scarcely kept within bounds by the force of human law? What security have we that the masses of the people will not band together and overturn in wild confusion the whole fabric of society, if they be not restrained by the moral power of conscience?

Many desultory efforts have been made to remedy this deplorable state of things. They are satisfactory, as proving the awakening spirit of zeal. The good already springing up from them is manifest and encouraging. But the success of these efforts must not blind us to their lamentable insufficiency. *It is much doubted whether the Churches built within the last ten years are sufficient even to meet the increase of the population during the same period.* But the mere erection of the fabrick of a Church is no proof that the religious wants of the population are supplied. Suppose a Church is built, in the midst of a dense population, capable of containing 1500 worshippers, or even more. Here, some will say, provision is made for 4,500 souls—a most erroneous inference. The endowment perhaps is scarcely enough to procure the services of some young curate just admitted into holy orders. An inexperienced clergyman is appointed to the district: he takes a small lodging, enters with zeal on his cure, but without the least

chance of embracing it under his pastoral care. All he can do is to maintain a rivalry in preaching with his dissenting neighbours. In a few years, probably, he retires with broken health, and is no more heard of. Take the example of Bethnal Green, which the excellent and indefatigable Bishop of the diocese has made the scene of his special exertions. It is proposed to build ten Churches, in addition to the two now existing, for a population of 74,000 souls, giving an average number of 6000 for each district. Suppose the ten Churches built—what can one clergyman, even with an assistant, do in the pastoral care of 6000 souls? Each district of that magnitude ought to have an experienced pastor, of mature age, with five or six curates under him, if the ordinances of religion are to be rightly administered, and the people receive a proper pastoral superintendence. Besides to the Clergy themselves it is unfair and cruel, in a nation wealthy as ours, to expect from them such arduous services without due reward. They ought at least to have a maintenance: they ought surely to have a decent provision for themselves and their families: they ought to have, if fairly dealt by, the prospect of honour and emolument, as in other professions. Parents will not educate their children for the ministry, if they have not the prospect either of decent maintenance or subsequent advancement. Already our best educated young men are betaking themselves to other pursuits; some are even leaving their country to keep sheep in Australia; while it is

difficult to supply the new Churches with ministers, much more with men competent to so vast a charge.

Again, of the Churches which have been built, many are altogether disgraceful to the nation from their meanness and shabbiness. They stand a lamentable contrast by the side of our ancient Churches—a proof of the want of piety of the age. Fortunately for the credit of the nineteenth century they will not long remain to bear witness against us. Some are so poorly built that they are already crumbling into ruins, or kept up with props and cramps of iron: very few indeed are worthy of the object for which they have been erected. But to whom are they a disgrace? not to those who built them, many of whom have made sacrifices even beyond their means: but they are a disgrace to the nation and more particularly to the diocese which did not furnish the means of erecting worthier structures.

What is the cause of this deplorable deficiency in a nation, whose forefathers were not wont to dole forth their offerings to God with so sparing a hand—a nation whose land is covered with the noblest monuments of ancient devotion, whose Church was once more than sufficient for the instruction of the people? Is it Protestantism which has given rise to this spirit? God forbid! let us hasten to wipe away the possibility of such a reproach. Is it poverty and want of means in the nation? Never perhaps was there so wealthy a nation under heaven; and never was the nation so laden with riches as she is now.

Every day her wealth is increasing. If it fails in one branch, new avenues are opened, new means of employing our still accumulating funds. It is scarcely too much to say, that the nation might, with the mere stroke of a pen, restore the Church to its full efficiency and scarcely feel the sacrifice.

Is it then from a penurious and niggardly spirit? Such I believe is not the case. For other purposes ample funds are readily forthcoming; but if a man builds a Church with rather more decoration than is absolutely necessary, or makes any thing like a suitable endowment, he is looked upon as rather an eccentric person, whose ideas of propriety differ from those of his neighbours. What then is the cause of this feeling? It is commonly stated that there is a covetous, selfish and irreligious spirit in us. Let us hope that such is not the case to the extent complained of. There is much of old English liberality, and a good deal of religious feeling of some sort. *All that is required is, that it should be drawn out and guided by those whom God has commissioned for that purpose.*

The following points may then perhaps be assumed as undeniable: that a lamentable inadequacy exists in our National Church; that the danger arising therefrom is imminent; that the sin rests upon the heads of us all; that the means of supplying the inadequacy are abundant; and, I trust I may add, that a spirit exists in the nation, which, if it be but called forth, is sufficient to remove the existing and impending evil.

In proposing any plan to meet these admitted evils, a preliminary difficulty at once occurs, namely, that it may appear presumptuous in individual members of the Church to move in a business which belongs rather to our Heads and Rulers. To this I answer, first, that the very principle of the plan, which I venture to propose, is *to put ourselves under the guidance of our Bishops, and to do nothing without them.* The extent of my presumptuousness is merely in suggesting a project for their consideration. But, secondly, I have good reason to believe that they themselves would be most willing and desirous to have such a call made on them; that they would desire nothing more, than that it should be made from so many quarters as to warrant them in taking decisive measures. No one who views the present state of affairs can fail to discern, that important and beneficial measures commonly originate in a general conviction of their necessity, and a gathering wish and demand for them. Our rulers, whether in Church or State, do not originate measures. The public mind is first impressed with the necessity of a certain movement; much is said, and thought, and written; until, when the time is ripe, some slight impulse is given; and those to whom God has committed the power bring the project to effect. We have several analogous precedents in the last year or two. The movement in Diocesan Education was projected by individuals, who submitted their views to the Bishops, which, being by them adopted, were carried into operation, and blessed by God with con-

siderable success. A similar process took place with regard to the Colonial Bishopricks. I would observe, however, that, in recent movements of the Church, there has been too much of mere temporary excitement. It has been like the crackling of thorns under a pot; the kindled zeal has burnt out after a short blaze without sufficient permanent results. Experience, therefore, teaches us that a movement for the restoration of the National Church must be based on a wider and deeper foundation.

In order to attempt so great an object, with good hope of success, it is submitted that the following features are necessary in the scheme. *First, that it be a simultaneous movement of the whole Church, acting under its lawful heads.* It must not be a party movement. The Church is so constituted, by the Providence of God, that no party or section in it, whether right or wrong in its principles, is able to act influentially without the others. Neither must it be a mere voluntary society. The inadequacy of societies to effect any great and extensive good, is plainly shown by the very limited success of those which have already been formed. Of course, when compared with each other, some have done a good deal; but, in comparison with what needs to be done, the efforts of all put together have been insignificant. The restoration of the Church is not an affair of guinea or five guinea subscriptions, or of circulars sent by the penny-post, or of travelling agents, or of meetings held at Exeter

Hall or Willis's Rooms. No, *it must be a solemn business, gravely taken up by the United Church*; it must be undertaken with a deep feeling of personal responsibility for past neglect; it must have in it the spirit of religious enthusiasm; it must be a crusade against the power of Satan, a vigorous and persevering effort to drive him from his position, to expel the enemy from holy ground. It must have in it something of the determined spirit of men who, having suffered shameful defeat, have at length rallied with a fixed resolution to wipe away the disgrace, and to drive the enemy from the post which they have allowed him to occupy. And to this end, the plan should be large, comprehensive, embracing every thing, aiming at complete restoration of the Church. It must not be a gradual business. If a famine is slaying our people, or if an enemy has landed on our shores, we do not take gradual methods to meet the evil; we resolve to do it at once. A voice goes forth throughout the land, the hearts of men respond, and every one resolves to do his best. So let us gird ourselves to the task before us, let us determine to do something effectual. *Let it be resolved, that with God's blessing, the Church shall be restored in the next ten years.* A great definite and bold scheme evinces a religious faith, and calls forth the enthusiasm of ardent minds, and enlists the sympathies of the mass of men. The mere desultory efforts hitherto made, being palliative only of the evil, enlist no

ardour in the cause. Doubtless many excellent persons have engaged in them under a strong sense of duty, and have effected much good in various places. But there has not been called forth that commanding energy and self-devotion which bears down all obstacles before it, which inspirits the good, rouses the dormant, drags with it the lukewarm, and forces even the hostile to lend a helping hand. Such a spirit, once kindled, would become with many a predominant motive, and would soon accomplish even more than was required. When the tabernacle of the Lord was to be built in the wilderness [1], Moses gathered all the congregation of the children of Israel together, and told them what the Lord required of them. "And they came every one whose heart stirred him up, and every one whom his spirit made willing; and they brought the Lord's offering to the work of the tabernacle of the congregation, and for all his service, and for the holy garments; and they came both men and women, as many as were willing hearted, and brought bracelets and earrings, and rings and tablets, and jewels of gold. . . . . And all the women that were wise hearted did spin with their hands, and brought that which they had spun. . . . . And the rulers brought onyx stones, and stones to be set for the ephod, and for the breastplate. . . . . And they spake unto Moses, saying, The people bring *much more than enough* for the service of

[1] See Exod. xxxv.

the work which the Lord commanded to make." Let us not despair of kindling such a zeal amongst the people, if the legitimate means are taken. There is something of this spirit even now exhibited amongst ourselves, though, as yet, in a manner quite unworthy of the work to be done. It is too much, however, the fashion amongst those who long for better things, to speak harshly of the various expedients whereby money is now with difficulty scraped together for sacred purposes. Let us not be too ready to judge. Let us believe that there is often something of pious enthusiasm even in the humblest efforts. Let us look on them as an index of a good spirit; and let us endeavour, not to check, but to draw it out, and fix it on higher objects, and render it holier, and more self-devoted.

And how is this to be done? How, but in the way indicated to us by God's word? As Moses plainly laid before the people what God required of them, *so let our rulers confidently appeal in the name of God to the people.* And let us trust that God will give them the willing heart and liberal hand.

I will now proceed respectfully to state the mode in which it is conceived the plan of Church restoration might commence. I say commence, because far be it from me to suppose that I am able to afford anything beyond a mere suggestion of what requires for its development and completion the united wisdom and authority of those whom God has been pleased to set over his Church. Besides, a plan em-

bracing the whole details of Church restoration, even if such a plan could be at once devised, would be far too startling in its magnitude, and disclose too many difficulties, to obtain general concurrence. It is enough to state in its full extent the object to be aimed at, and to suggest a reasonable mode of commencement: the final execution of the plan must be left to God's good providence.

The way in which, if it seems good to those whose business it is to decide, it is thought that a commencement might be made, is by *a Committee of Inquiry acting under the authority of the Bishops.* Perhaps the most regular plan would be for the Bishops assembled in synod to appoint such a committee; but since, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the Church in its present connexion with the State, such a proceeding might be inconvenient, there seems no reason why a certain number of the members of the Church should not offer themselves for this purpose. Suppose then that six laymen and six clergymen, who felt sincerely desirous of aiding in so good a work, were to make a formal tender of their services, through his Grace the Primate, to the Bishops generally, for the purpose of making such inquiries, and aiding in such measures as their Lordships might think fit to authorize or direct. This is no crude and sudden suggestion; but one long thought of—one on which I have conversed with many persons whose opinions are weighty: and I may venture to state, from actual knowledge, that there are men prepared

to come forward in this work, whose station and character is such as to warrant the faithful performance of the necessary duties. If the Bishops do not think fit to accept their services, of course the scheme would fall to the ground. But I do not for a moment entertain a suspicion that their Lordships would hesitate to accept such an offer, from persons so qualified, and submitting themselves to be guided entirely by their spiritual rulers. Supposing, then, that the Bishops should approve the general proposal, and accept the services tendered to them, it would be for their Lordships to determine, in the first place, what should be the constitution of the committee, and its relation to themselves; whether it should act separately under their guidance; or, if that should appear inconvenient, owing to the want of any means whereby the Bishops are able to communicate their wishes as a body—then, whether, their Lordships, *ex officio*, or any of their number deputed by the rest, would deem it right to be members of the committee, and give their personal assistance and counsel according to their convenience and opportunities.

The preliminary step of the constitution of the committee being decided, then it is thought that the first function of the committee would be *to collect accurate statistical information as to the actual deficiency in the means of the Church.* Some persons, perhaps, may think that the great and acknowledged deficiency might be assumed, and means at once adopted for

its remedy. But this is the very plan which has for years been unsuccessfully pursued. The principle of the present measure is *to embrace the whole subject*, to ascertain its real magnitude. And it is thought that the very circumstance of a thorough investigation, set on foot by the Bishops, will raise the expectations of the Church and nation, and prepare the way for a vigorous effort to meet the ascertained want. Perhaps, also, it may be found that the work to be done is not of that overpowering magnitude which is supposed when compared with the means and resources of the nation.

It is also of primary importance to decide *on what basis the inquiry should be made.* The widest and most comprehensive investigation seems to be the most satisfactory. The mere test of "Church accommodation" (as it is called) is altogether fallacious; because, as has been already shown, it is no proof of pastoral superintendence. A large Church, served by a single minister, would accommodate a far greater number of persons than, with their families, he is able to superintend. It would seem desirable also, in order to set forth a true view of the real wants of the nation, to consider not only the positive condition of the Church, but also its state, *as compared with other periods and other countries.*

First, then, as regards the highest order of clergy—*the Bishops.* Is the present number sufficient to oversee the population of this nation? The inquiry

on this head might be carried into the field of historical research, and might begin by a comparison of the number of souls placed under the spiritual superintendence of English bishops in the present century, with the population of the same dioceses in earlier periods, or with the average extent of dioceses in other parts of Christendom. Some light might be obtained from the example of the Apostles. The well-known opinion of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, as to the necessity of an increased number of Bishops, even in their time, might also be considered.

Respecting the comparative state of other countries with our own in this respect, I have been favoured by a friend[1] on whom I have perfect reliance, with the following statement:—

"Italy, Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia, with a population of at least 24 millions, have in round numbers 270 Sees.

"We, with 16 millions in England and Wales, have only 26.

"Greece, with less than a million population, has 36 Sees.

"France, before the Revolution, had 145 Sees, and 28 millions.

"Spain, 60 Bishops, and 10 or 12 millions.

[1] The Rev. W. Palmer, of Worcester College, Oxford.

"Romanists in Ireland, $6\frac{1}{2}$ or 7 millions, and 30 Bishops.

"American church (less than a million) has 20 Bishops.

"Ancient Asia Minor, about twice as large as England, had 400 Sees."

From which statement it will appear that a single Bishop in these several countries has had the following numbers committed to his spiritual charge:—

In Italy, Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia.....	88,000.
In Greece	27,000.
In France, before the Revolution	193,000.
In Spain	183,000.
In America	50,000.
In Ancient Asia Minor	80,000.
In England.....	666,000.

Now can any good reason be assigned why the richest nation in the world should be so ill provided in this respect? Why should we stand thus in contrast with other Churches? Will it be said that our Bishops are sufficient for our population, and that other nations have had too many? Then let us consider what are the duties of Bishops. Surely a Bishop ought to have the opportunity of making himself acquainted with every clergyman and every parish in his diocese, and not be known to his flock only in a hasty triennial visitation. It might be

well, therefore, to compute how many times in their lives the Bishops in some of our larger dioceses could by possibility visit and preach in each parish of their dioceses. It might also reasonably be considered whether the prevalence of schism, and the ignorance of the true character of the Church, and apathy as to its interest, may not be in a great measure traced to the want of personal intercourse between the people and their Bishops, in consequence of the overwhelming extent of their dioceses; and perhaps it might be found on investigation, *that no more effectual step could be taken in Church restoration, than to assign to each Bishop a diocese of manageable size, so that he might reasonably hope, with God's blessing on his labour, to "set in order" all that was wanting in it.*

Those who are most intimately acquainted with the practical operations of the Church will be best aware of the obstruction and inconvenience which arises from the enormous extent of our dioceses. Take only one instance, the scheme of Diocesan Education. Great zeal on the subject is called forth; a successful meeting is held; every thing seems to promise well; a central establishment is formed; and the diocese is divided into districts with a view to carry out the scheme. But it is soon found that the different districts, especially the more distant, not having heard the central discussions, do not understand the principles of the scheme, or do not agree about the details, or view the arrangements in the

different lights. There is no unity of action; some pull one way and some another; and the whole scheme, perhaps the most vitally important scheme undertaken of late years by the Church, is in danger of miscarrying, simply from the extent of the diocese, and the want of one master spirit, which shall control and direct the whole.

The notion of no more Bishops being appointed, because they could not have seats in the House of Lords, seems now to be very little regarded; or if it be thought an inconvenience, it seems to be acknowledged that the inconvenience should not be for a moment set in comparison with the urging necessity of the Church. Besides, the new Bishops might be of inferior rank to the old. Why should not a general move take place?—the two Metropolitans be made Patriarchs; the present Bishops, Metropolitans; the present Deans and Archdeacons be consecrated as Bishops; the Rural Deans take the place of Archdeacons; and others of the inferior Clergy appointed to fill the vacancies made by the Rural Deans? All this may appear very presumptuous in me to allude to; but I only throw it out, as being a legitimate part of the inquiry to be made, if sanctioned by their Lordships, with a view to the thorough restoration of the Church to its proper efficiency. If the facts elicited prove a large increase of our number of Bishops to be necessary, what should hinder a great nation like ours from making it? It is mere prejudice to think that our Church

should be always of its present extent. We boast that we live in days of reform, and do not scruple to make such alterations as are proved to be necessary. While every thing else is advancing around us, why should the Church alone stand still? In doctrine and in discipline it will indeed remain the same till the end of time; but in extent it should surely be adapted to the existing exigencies of the nation.

The next point to be considered by the "Bishops' Committee," would be the number of *priests, or parochial ministers.* Of the lamentable deficiency of this order of the Clergy there can be no doubt. The object of the committee would be to ascertain the exact amount of that deficiency; and, for this purpose, it would not be enough to take the gross census of the population, and compare it with the numbers of the Clergy; but examination should be specially made into the condition of each parish, with a view to the entire rearrangement of parishes where lapse of time has rendered the present arrangement defective, so as to apportion a manageable district to each pastor. This is a very different thing from recommending an arbitrary breaking up of old existing arrangements, or a new distribution into sections and departments, after the French revolutionary fashion. The less alteration which can be made, consistently with a proper supply of the ordinances of the Church to the people, the better. The large majority of parishes would probably be found to do very well as they are; but in others the old

arrangement must give place to ascertained necessity. Some parishes might require simply to be divided into two or more parts; in other cases it might be desirable to form a new parish out of portions of several which are contiguous. On all these points it would be necessary, that the committee acting in the name, and under the authority of the Bishops, should strictly inquire, and report in minute detail.

Thirdly, with regard to *deacons*. It might, if their Lordships should think fit, be a part of the inquiry, whether in some places,—especially in compact and very populous districts, where the Clergy are much embarrassed in their spiritual functions, by the necessity of attending to schools, and other temporal affairs of their flock,—the deficiency of pastoral superintendence would not more easily be remedied by the appointment of an increased number of deacons rather than of priests:—whether, for instance, when the population of a parish exceeded a thousand souls, a deacon for each additional thousand might not be advantageously appointed to aid the priest in his labours. Something of this sort appears to have been the frequent practice of the early Church, and would perhaps offer in some cases, an easier mode of meeting the present difficulty than any other. It is strictly in accordance with the plan adopted by the Apostles under similar circumstances.

With regard also to the *residences of the Clergy*, strict inquiry should be made. We hear, or used to

hear, complaints of non-residence. In the majority of cases, it will probably be found, that non-residence has arisen from the want of houses for the Clergy to live in. Give every clergyman a good house, and you will soon find men to reside in them. Can any one for a moment doubt that there ought to be a good and decent residence for the clergyman in every parish? Why then are they not built? It might be well, however, to inquire, whether in large towns and cities, where the curates of the different parishes amount to a considerable number, the best, as well as the cheapest, mode of providing residences for them, would not be by founding colleges, in which, so long as they were unmarried, they might associate together under the superintendence of a principal, instead of living by themselves in lodgings, as they generally do at present. They would then enjoy a society congenial with their habits, without being induced to mix too much with the world at large.

Again, as to *endowments;* this, of course, would be a principal object of inquiry. To provide proper endowments for the Clergy, would, perhaps, be the most difficult point of all. But if a full statement of the case were laid before the Church by the Bishops, and the public were made acquainted with the miserable and niggard manner in which so many of the Clergy are provided for, they could not in justice refuse a proper maintenance to a body of men on whom such severe duties are imposed. It is under-

stood that the operations of the Ecclesiastical Commission are directed to the increasing the endowments of livings, where the population is above 2000, to 150*l.* This will not be thought an excessive income for a married Clergyman to live on. It is, no doubt, the best mode in which the funds, now placed in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commission, can be employed. And it is most important that the Commission *should have distinctly stated what they intend to do*, and what their funds will allow them to do, and should not attempt to do more. If, as it is stated, their funds for the next sixteen years will enable them only to raise the endowments of the present Clergy to 150*l.* a year, then all the other manifold requirements of the Church are left unprovided for, and the public will no longer be able to shrink from their duty, with the excuse that the Ecclesiastical Commission can do any thing to relieve them from it.

Lastly, with regard to *the fabric of the Church*, which is generally made the first and almost the only subject of inquiry. Perhaps, under the present palliative system, it could not be otherwise. Every thing cannot be done at once; and we may wisely build a Church this year in the faith and hope of endowing it in the next. But in a simultaneous inquiry into the whole state of the Church, mere Church accommodation is but one amongst the pressing subjects which demand attention. It would also be highly import-

ant in any extensive measure to take steps, that the new Churches should be constructed so as to last beyond the present generation, and should be so arranged that the services of our Liturgy may be properly performed in them.

Such then would be the principal topics of inquiry. *The main object of it would be to ascertain the exact amount of what, in the opinion of our spiritual rulers, is actually wanted in each diocese, in order to make the Church again in reality a National Establishment.* The Report might be accompanied or followed up, as soon as their Lordships thought fit, by appeals and exhortations to the members of the Church, on the urgent necessity of meeting the evil, and with suggestions as to the various modes in which the work might be accomplished.

It would be premature to enter upon this branch of the duties of the committee, until the necessary preliminary inquiries shall have been made—for which two or three months might suffice. A solemn appeal to the nation by the heads of the Church, and a statement from each Bishop to the members of his own diocese, accompanied by documentary evidence of what was actually required, could not but have a powerful influence on the consciences of men. If the Bishop stated that here a Church was wanted, and there a Church, and asked, 'Who was on the Lord's side? who would offer himself to the work?'—we may be sure that many, like the Israel-

ites of old, would start forward and answer to the call. In some instances one would take the whole burden on himself; elsewhere, one person would engage to join with others in doing what he was unable to do from his own resources. The example of good deeds is catching; help would spring up where least expected.

The operation of the "Bishops' Committee" need not in the least interfere either with the Incorporated Society, or with the various local Societies which, under their respective Bishops, have already accomplished so much of the good which has been effected, and want only a stimulus to render them efficient agents in the necessary work; in the same way that the National Society and the Diocesan Boards of Education have been prompted to more active exertion by the Committee of Inquiry, sanctioned by the Bishops. It will, after all, be by local energies, if at all, that the principal work must be done.

Seeing, however, that the various modes adopted by existing Societies have hitherto been ineffectual in accomplishing anything approaching to what is required, it may be well to consider whether some new engine or some new principle may not be brought into operation. A restoration of the Church can never be effected without a great change of feeling amongst Churchmen, or rather without a development and expansion of the good feeling, of

the existence of which we have so many proofs. We shall do nothing great until the minds of Christian men are embued with a sense of the paramount importance of restoring their Church, for the glory of God, and for the sake of the souls of their brethren.

Now how are strong feelings to be raised? How is a generous enthusiasm to be kindled? Not by mere argument: men will acknowledge the force of an argument, yet not act upon it. A rich man rolling in wealth will listen to an able sermon or read a startling statement of the wants of the nation, be perfectly convinced, and, instead of building a Church, he *will subscribe a guinea!* It is not argument that is wanted. Argument alone is but a feeble instrument to move a nation. What we want is *authority, guidance, impulse,*—the example of others acting in the same direction, especially of those whose example we are bound to follow,—reiterated appeals made, in God's name, by those to whom we are bound to listen.

It is not, perhaps, sufficiently observed, that the only occasion on which the great duty of providing for the spiritual wants of our brethren is authoritatively set before Christian congregations, as a religious duty, is just once in three years; when, on the issuing of a Queen's letter, the Bishop of each diocese directs the Clergy to urge this duty on their flock. But what effect is this triennial appeal likely to

have? True, that it is productive of a considerable sum of money when all is put together. But it has no permanent effect, no moral influence on the habits and wills of men. The consequence of the scanty appeal is, that *thousands of excellent Christian people do not know the extent of the need and the urgency of the duty.* Multitudes of persons I am persuaded there are, in the upper and middle classes of life, who would willingly do infinitely more than they do, if *they were but told, by those who had a right to tell them, what they ought to do.* It is true that they receive continual appeals from individuals, or from self-constituted societies, circulars without number from every part of the country. But these appeals are often made in such a manner, the amount of the demand is so small,—that, instead of appearing a solemn duty, an air of ridicule and levity is thrown over the whole affair; those who are petulant throw the demand from them with contempt; others, who are more good-natured, give "their mite" as they term it, grudging only the trouble caused them by sending it.

God forbid that we should sneer at the humblest offering made by the poor man for the glory of God; or that we should disdain the accumulated contributions which might be collected from our teeming population. No; it is *the rich man's mite,* the shillings carelessly scattered, the guinea and five guinea subscriptions made by those who will not

miss them. these are what ruin the cause of Church extension. *Men must be taught to sacrifice something which they will really miss*, before God's Church can be rebuilt or its bulwarks repaired.

It is therefore respectfully submitted to those in authority, whether the revival of the ancient Scriptural practice of exhorting the people *to set apart on the first day of each week a portion of their means as an offering to God*, and this repeated every Sunday, might not be likely to have the effect of turning the current of men's thoughts, and accustoming them to think seriously on the spiritual wants of their brethren, and impressing them with a feeling of the paramount duty of making provision for them according to their means. This appeal might be accompanied by some brief address on the subject, or some appropriate sentence from Scripture or some clause introduced by proper authority into the offertory, that God would be pleased to accept our offerings for the restoration of the Church. By this method it might be hoped that a solemn feeling of duty would be kindled in the hearts of the people—a feeling on which the whole success of any scheme of Church restoration seems practically to depend.

Of course there are a thousand objections to this or any other project which can be named. Timid, or even wise and prudent persons, will discern difficulties in the way of any great exertion. But for what are difficulties permitted but to be surmounted?

Do we suppose that the Providence of God has ordained that our Church *cannot* be restored ? Besides, let us consider the alternative,—to go on maintaining a losing contest with advancing difficulties, to see the continuance or increase of all the existing horrors of Socialism, Chartism, and all the crimes and vices of a demoralized population. Surely some attempt to conquer difficulties may well be hazarded.

On the other hand, there are many causes of hope and encouragement. The circumstance of the decennial census now being made affords a favourable opportunity for obtaining exact statistical inquiries upon which the attempt would be based. Many persons are moved by facts and figures, who are not open to other modes of conviction.

Again, the Church has surely a right to expect advantage from the present political aspect of affairs. She has long been labouring under discouragement, approaching to persecution, which, though grievous for the time, has taught her to rely on her own strength and the divine support. I will not now discuss the question of a Government grant. If a grant be made, it will be the Church's duty to exert herself to the utmost of her means to meet it. If a grant be refused, it will behove the Church to exert herself, even beyond her means, to remedy the deficiency. But whether a grant be made or not, surely it is not too much to expect that every facility and encouragement which legislative aid can afford, for

carrying out the measures which the heads of the Church may recommend, will gladly be afforded by the parliament now elected.

But these are topics from which I purposely abstain.

The restoration of the Church is not a mere political question, but a great religious duty. We should not despise the aid which human agents or human events may afford, but our trust should be on the piety of our cause, and the promise of God, that He will aid and uphold his Church even to the end of time.

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

A LETTER

ON

CATHOLIC UNITY,

ADDRESSED TO

THE RIGHT HON. THE

EARL OF SHREWSBURY,

BY

NICHOLAS, BISHOP OF MELIPOTAMUS.

LONDON:

CHARLES DOLMAN, 61, NEW BOND STREET.

MDCCCXLI.

LONDON: RICHARDS, PRINTER, ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The following Letter was in great part written before the late ministerial changes. Circumstances have delayed its publication; but it has not been deemed advisable to introduce any alterations into it.

St. Mary's College,
St. Matthew's Day, 1841.

A LETTER,

ETC.

My Dear Lord,

Your Lordship's desire, so kindly expressed, to be informed of anything interesting with reference to the present religious crisis in this country, emboldens me to address you in this Letter; and if you receive it through the medium of the press rather than of the post, you will easily understand the reason,—that there are many others whom I am not unwilling that this expression of my sentiments should reach.

Perhaps the circumstance, of such a letter appearing at such a moment, may be construed into an expression of political feeling, or explained in connexion with the ministerial changes just about to ensue. I can, however, assure your Lordship, in all sincerity, that I have no views or feelings that will justify any such interpretation: "*Deo et Ecclesiæ*," is the only dedication which I wish to premise to the few observations which I am going to address to you. At the same time, I cannot but think that any ministry which has to try its skill

upon the fortunes of the empire, has one powerful chord in its hand, as yet untouched, whose thrilling spell for restoring its disturbed harmonies might be more successfully now than ever before tried. I am sure that your Lordship will agree with me, that the very attempt to heal the religious sores of this noble country would immortalize any minister who should undertake it. May I not add, that the neglect of this great moral plague is enough, in the end, to frustrate every other effort to cure its evils?

Disunion is the great bane of our actual state. The majesty and might of a nation are perfect, when all the elements of national dignity and power tend to one single goal, and draw powerfully after them the people and their rulers: when the clergy, the aristocracy, the industrious classes of every sort, work under the influence of the same rules of conduct, estimate one another by the same standard, view each other's prerogatives and duties by the same light, understand the importance and obligation of mutual sacrifices, upon a common principle, and, in one word, labour under the same law for the same ends. But with us how is it? Every class stands isolated, considering the other's prosperity its ruin; the other's advantage its loss: the component parts of a great state are animated with an antagonist disintegrating power; instead of harmonies, we have jarring discords; in place of union, conflicting interests. Between the aristocracy and

the poorer classes, a distance and coolness, anciently (I mean in Catholic times) unknown, has long existed; which the modern phrenzies of Chartism and Socialism are doing their utmost to arouse into hatred and enmity. The clergy of the Established Church are far from possessing that weight and influence with the people which are necessary for controling their passions, or securing their forbearance under distress, or guiding them in their more prosperous condition. In large towns, immense masses are withdrawn from their care, either by total neglect of religion, or by having joined dissent. Among the followers of the various sects they are so far from being held in reverence, as the recognized ministers of God, that they are looked upon with dislike, often with animosity; while those who preside over dissenting congregations are naturally considered by the established clergy as mere pretenders, and their followers as deluded schismatics. The Catholic stands between the two, unable to recognize the claims of either, but connected, in belief and communion, with the great Church Catholic, through the Holy See. Again, if we look at the various components of the temporal welfare of the country, we find division of feelings; —the agricultural and manufacturing "interests," as they are called, are in a state of rivalry; whatever is done for the one is scanned with jealousy and fear by the other, as likely to injure it; instead of being two forces conjointly acting on the

same end of the lever, they are as scales upon the opposite extremities, so tremulously balanced, that the one cannot rise without the other's being depressed; that momentum given to either, acts as power taken from the other; and one cannot move without its rival's moving in an opposite direction. A similar conflict of rights every now and then appears between landed and funded proprietorships, whenever there is a hint of burthening the latter. I need not add that the spirit of disunion manifests itself still further in the greater portions of our empire; England and Ireland being alienated in love, through the injustice and unkindness of the former; and many of our colonies having given us no slight signs of very precarious attachment towards the mother-country.

It will be said, perhaps, that notwithstanding our differences, we have prospered, and still do flourish. So doubtless did the Roman Commonweal, in spite of the strifes between patricians and plebeians, and between Romans and allies. But the end came; and came so frightfully, that the wisest and best thought unity of government (though purchased at a terrible price) preferable to the miseries at length engendered by disunion. We have not, thank God, come to such a crisis. But the thought is manifestly beginning to work in the breasts of many: is it not time to seek a remedy for a state of things, which every day begins to unfold its consequences with a more fatal reality?

Some, too, will say; if we have prospered till now, or till lately, in this state of mutual estrangement, how *should* we have prospered if we had all worked together? If the resultant of our conflicting forces has been so great, what would that of our conspiring forces have been?

One is generally inclined to mistrust a remedy proposed as a *panacea* or universal medicine; but surely where all the disease has but one root—where all its symptoms have but one character—we shall not be visionary in proposing one remedy. But if this be necessary on higher and better considerations; if it stand above the mere calculation of expediency, and recommend itself upon its own merits, independently of our wants; if it be moreover urged upon us by a growing sense of its importance, its justice, its truth, we surely shall not hesitate about considering at least the possibility of attaining it, and the best means of doing so. There is no influence which can so easily reach the most hidden causes of evil, or so effectually counteract them, as religion: there is nothing, therefore, which can so securely penetrate to the principles of disunion, and heal them, and reunite the separated parts, as *religious unity*. It will act the same upon the dissension between noble and plebeian, as on that between priest and layman: upon the feuds between province and province, as on the differences between man and man. And if it shall have once removed what is so

evil, it will soon substitute for it what is good and wholesome. Religious unity, entwined round the affections which unite us, first as social beings, and then as members of one state—round our humanity and our patriotism—would form that "triple cord," of which we are told that it is "not easily broken."*

In thus speaking of religious unity as a great moral and social boon, your Lordship will, I am sure, understand that I do not wish to overlook those greater and higher motives, for endeavouring to attain it, which result from religious considerations themselves, that is from the absolute oneness of truth itself; from the clear principle, that all but one of diverse opinions must be erroneous, and that consequently it is the general duty to remove all these, or rather to merge them all into the one and true. But, unhappily, there are many who look at these subjects more through the medium of worldly expediencies, than through the clear light of simple religious evidence; and it may not be unbecoming to convince even them, that very great public benefits must result from the restoration of religious unity. Those who weep, upon higher motives, over the wretched dismemberment of the ancient English Catholic Church, need not, to awaken their co-operation, the reflections in which I have indulged.

* Funiculus triplex difficile rumpitur.—*Eccles.* iv. 12.

But the idea of all England's being, in religion, one, is incompatible with her remaining in her present state of ecclesiastical and religious isolation, as under the rule of a "national" Church, in the strict and invidious sense of the word, that is, separated from the religious communion of the rest of the world. We Catholics must necessarily deplore the separation, as a deep moral evil; as a state of schism of which nothing can justify the continuance. Many members of the Anglican Church view it in the same light as to the first point—its sad evil; though they excuse their individual position in it, as an unavoidable misfortune. Many of us, therefore, are, in accordance thus far, that the sooner an end can be put to the present painful position of the Anglican Church, with relation to the rest of the world, the better; and we may depend upon a willing, an able, and a most zealous co-operation with any effort which we may make, towards bringing her into her rightful position, in Catholic unity with the Holy See, and the Churches of its obedience—in other words, with the Church Catholic. Is this a visionary idea? is it merely the expression of a strong desire? I know that many will so judge it; and perhaps were I to consult my own quiet, I would not venture to express it. But I will, in simplicity of heart, cling to hopefulness, cheered, as I feel it, by so many promising appearances.

We find on a former occasion, that a great pre-

late, like the "Eagle of Meaux," felt it a duty to enter into earnest discussion with Leibnitz, upon the possibility of reuniting Germany to the Roman Church, when there was nothing to encourage, nothing to promise success, except the desire of political rulers, and the zeal, however enlightened, of Molanus alone; but no feeling of want, no craving eagerness on the part of the separated Church herself, no yearnings after unity, no filial respect for the mother-church on the part of her teachers. If this has been considered no discredit to one of Bossuet's immense perspicacity and great prudence, surely, one so much his inferior in every respect, need not be severely blamed, if he attach some importance to the gradual approximation of many to the same desirable end, and reject not at once, and utterly, their now clearly expressed wishes of seeing their Church restored to Catholic communion. Again, Bossuet was a foreign bishop, having no stake or responsibility in that country, and yet he deemed it his duty (instead of at once scouting all advances on the other side) to attend seriously to the most partial proposal for a restoration to unity, and to treat it with earnestness and kindness, and to devote his talents to forward and mature it. Surely it will not be thought inconsiderate in one who *has* a deep and an eternal interest laid in this kingdom, who has a personal and serious stake in that very portion of it which forms the centre and focus of the new movement, to pay attention to

far more striking and more positive declarations of a similar desire, and to direct his small ability to seeking the best means of accomplishing it. I will therefore presume to place before your Lordship's zealous consideration a few points, which strike me as worthy of serious attention; though they will be mere sketches or hints, of what may become, before long, subjects of more finished and detailed exposition.

I. It may seem necessary, especially in addressing one, who, like your Lordship, has been for some time out of England, to state my reasons for seeing, or (perhaps some will say) imagining, that I see an approximation not merely towards individual Catholic practices or doctrines, but towards Catholic union. It is often difficult to give, in form of a specific proof, that which arises from a great combination of various evidences, in their converging force carrying conviction. But it seems to me impossible to read the works of the Oxford divines, and especially to follow them chronologically, without discovering a daily approach towards our holy Church, both in doctrine and in affectionate feeling. Our saints, our popes, have become dear to them by little and little; our rites and ceremonies, our offices, nay our very rubrics, are precious in their eyes, far, alas! beyond what many of us consider them: our monastic institutions, our charitable and educational provisions have become more and more objects with

them of earnest study; and everything, in fine, that concerns our religion, deeply interests their attention. I know what some will say,—that all this interest is of an *interested* character; that they wish to take so much from us as may serve to give consistency to their own Church, but have no idea of advancing further, or aiming at reunion with us. This suspicion is, I conceive, unjust and ungrounded; it is based upon ignorance of the true character and feelings of these writers. Their admiration of our institutions and practices, and their regret at having lost them, manifestly spring from the value which they set upon everything *Catholic;* and to suppose them (without an insincerity which they have given us no right to charge them with) to love the parts of a system, and wish for them, while they would reject the root, and only secure support of them,—the system itself,—is to my mind revoltingly contradictory. But this is by no means all. Peruse, my dear Lord, the following passage, now two years old:

"The English Church, the glory of Christendom, where Bede taught, and whence Boniface went forth, now sits solitary among the nations. The Queen of the Isles, how has she suffered amid the passions of men! how straitened within her seas, who once had a continent for range, and its bishops for her hosts or guests! It avails not to look at the past; what was done is (as they say) 'a matter of history,' which means, we may en-

tertain our own private opinion about it. The result is pretty clear; Christendom is broken up, and we have suffered not less than other nations from the convulsion. Rome, Greece, and England, all have suffered; but just at this moment we are speaking about ourselves. We then have lost the sympathy of the world; and those who deprived us of it have felt in duty bound to do what they could to make up to us our loss. The civil power, which has cut us off from Christendom, has done, it must be confessed, its utmost to reconcile us to our degradation. It has maintained, of course, our captivity as a first principle of the constitution, but it has taken every pains to keep us from fretting. If the Church was to exist at all in England, it was like a law of the Medes and Persians, that she must exist for England alone. She must be a prisoner if she was to be an inmate; but, that being taken for granted, she has been accorded a most honourable captivity. Nothing has been denied her short of freedom; power, wealth, influence, rank, consideration, have been showered upon her, to make her as happy as the day is long. She has been like Rasselas in a happy valley, or like the Crusader in Armida's garden; what want was unsupplied? Yet it is said of our first parent, under far more blessed circumstances: 'For Adam there was not found a help meet for him,'—*aliquid desideravere oculi*,—which neither fawning beast nor painted bird could supply. He

found a want in Paradise itself; and so upon this our poor Church of England, which is not in Paradise, this evil has fallen, in spite of 'princes and other children of men,' that she has been a solitary. She has been among strangers; statesmen, lawyers, and soldiers frisked and prowled around: creatures, wild or tame, have held a parliament over her, but still she has wanted some one to converse with, to repose on, to consult, to love. The state, indeed, to judge by its acts, has thought it unreasonable in her, that she could not find in a lion and an unicorn a sufficient object for her affections."—*Brit. Crit.* Oct. 1839, p. 282.

I might refer your Lordship to another article in the same review, of which I believe Mr. Newman is the acknowledged author,—on the "Catholicity of the English Church," in the number for January of last year. I could not quote, perhaps, with perfect satisfaction, any given passage in it; but no one will, I think, read it without feeling sure that the isolated position of the Anglican Church, and her separation from the rest of the world, are a cause of deep regret, and that, if removal of the evil could be rendered probable, all pains would be taken to secure it.

Further proof of the view which I present is this: that general dissatisfaction at the system of the Anglican Church is clearly expressed in the works of these authors: it is not a blame cast on one article or another, it is not blemish found in

one practice, or a Catholic want in a second, or a Protestant redundancy in a third: but there is an impatient sickness of the whole; it is the weariness of a man who carries a burthen,—it is not of any individual stick of his faggot that he complains,—it is the bundle which tires and worries him. The dependance of the Church on the State, its Egyptian task-master and oppressor (as they deem it), the want of a proper influence of the clergy in the appointment of their bishops, and of power in the bishops to rule with effect; the weakness of the Church in enforcing spiritual censures; the destruction of all conciliary authority in the hierarchy; the Protestant spirit of the Articles in the aggregate, and their insupportable uncatholicism in specific points; the loss of ordinances, sacraments, and liturgical rites; the extinction of the monastic and ascetic feeling and observances; the decay of "awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be specially called Catholic;"* the miserable feeling of solitariness and separation above described;—these are but a portion of the grievances whereof we meet complaints at every turn, the removal of which would involve so thorough a change in the essential condition of the Anglican Church, as these writers must feel would bring her within the sphere of attraction of all-absorbing unity, and could not long withhold her from the embrace of its centre.

* Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 26, second edition.

But if we want express declaration of the contemplation of such an event, as the necessary consequence of the purification at which they aim, the following concluding words of Mr. Ward's second pamphlet will, I think, suffice :

"No! those *who hold strong opinions on the subject of our Church's present corruption and degradation,* whatever pain they may inflict on others by making such avowal, whatever pain they may receive themselves from the din of praise surrounding her, in which the words 'pure and Apostolical' sound forth most clearly and distinctly on the ear, at least enjoy this great comfort more than others are able to enjoy,—their love and sympathy for 'those who are without.' *In proportion as we lament the state of things within, in proportion as we humbly confess that the mark of being Christ's kingdom, which can never be wholly effaced from any portion of it, is obscured and but faintly traced on the English Church,* in that proportion we are able to make the fuller allowance for those who have failed to discern it. When apparent sanctity exists without the Church, or within it among those who have lost its spirit, two solutions are possible for the Churchman ; that the sanctity is *but* apparent, or that the Church is far from what she ought to be. May we, in cases when such holiness shows itself not in words, but in a steady and self-denying course of action, have grace always to choose the latter alternative ; may

we consider the fruits of grace which exist so abundantly among Protestants as a rebuke to ourselves, for having as yet so inadequately brought out the image of what is *truly* evangelical; may we Catholics of the English Church throw ourselves in a loving spirit upon the thought of unworldliness, purity, self-denial, from whatever quarter they are presented. In no other way shall we be able to build up our own Church into a form truly *Catholic*, (appealing, that is, to the *whole* nature of persons of all variety of taste and disposition), strictly watching the truth, yet anxiously preserving charity; *and by which, having absorbed into herself all that are truly God's servants among ourselves, she may well hope that her influence will react for good on those sisters in other lands from whom she has been so long and so fatally dissevered; and thus, when she has been, by a natural attraction and as it were spontaneously, restored to active communion with the rest of Christendom, once more, if God permit, the united Catholic Church will go forth in a spirit of steady aggression against the world.*"—pp. 90, 91.

Again, your Lordship has probably been informed of the "Prayers for Unity" which have appeared at Oxford, to be recited "on Thursday morning," and in which some of the same psalms and the same versicles have been selected, as in the little prayer-book published two years ago in London. Another

prayer "for the Unity of Holy Church," has likewise been printed at Lichfield, in Latin and English, by the Rev. F. Wackerbarth.* In fine, the beautiful letter from a young member of the University of Oxford, which some time ago appeared in the *Univers*, spoke of the same earnest and anxious desire, on behalf of many, as the object of prayer and fasting, during the most solemn season of the year. Such are some of the many *public* manifestations of a sincere yearning after Catholic unity, from influential men in the Church of England. I need not ask *you* whether they ought to be met with any other feeling than sympathy, kindness, and offers of hearty co-operation? Ought we to sit down coldly, while such sentiments are breathed in our hearing, and rise not up to bid the mourner have hope? Are we, who sit in the full light, to see our friends feeling their way towards us through the gloom that surrounds them, and faltering for want of an outstretched hand, or turning astray for want of a directing voice; and sit on, and keep silent, amusing ourselves at their painful efforts, or perhaps allow them to hear, from time to time, only the suppressed laugh of one who triumphs over their

* Since this Letter was commenced, this gentleman has published one, addressed to the then *future* prime-minister of England, on the reunion of the Churches. It well deserves serious attention; but the author's expressions concerning myself are too personally kind to allow me to speak, as I might wish, concerning his production.

distress? God forbid! If one *must* err, if in mere tribute to humanity, one must needs make a false step, one's fall will be more easy when on the side of two theological virtues, than when on the cold, bare earth of human prudence. If I shall have been both too hopeful in my motives, and too charitable in my dealings, I will take my chance of smiles at my simplicity, both on earth and in heaven. Those of the latter at least are never scornful.

II. That the feelings which have been expressed, in favour of a return to unity by the Anglican Church, are every day widely spreading and deeply sinking, no one who has means of judging, I think, can doubt. Those sentiments have a silent echo in hundreds of sympathising bosoms, and they who receive them as sounds dear to them, are not idle in communicating their own thoughts to many more, over whom they have influence; and thus has a far more general sense been awakened, than appears at first sight, to the religious state of things. There are many evidences (which it would be hardly proper to detail) that Catholic feelings have penetrated deeper into society than at first one would suspect. Whole parishes have received the leaven, and it is fermenting; and places where it might least be expected, seem to have received it in more secret and myterious ways.

III. This being the situation of things, one naturally turns to the consideration of the duties that

spring from it. And first, as to those most removed in general from the purely sacred consideration of them. What becomes the duty of civil rulers? It seems to me there hardly can be a question. Every sincere follower of Anglican principles must acknowledge that, if possible, there ought to be unity among Christians, and that it is a violent state of the Church to have its parts separated and kept asunder. It must be a matter of regret with any such, that circumstances should have ever led to such a condition of things; and there must be a wish, based upon principle, that the time may come, when these circumstances having ceased, that condition may be altered, and that religious unity which existed in primitive ages be restored. The matter presented in its practical view will be this. So long as the Established Church spoke no word on the subject, so long as no hint was uttered that it appeared desirable and timely to attempt a return to religious unity, statesmen were not called on to consider the question. No one complained of the nature of the laws bearing on the point, except we, whose complaints were too insignificant to be thought worth notice. But when the question becomes raised in that Church herself, when it excites the interest of her best members, and leading characters, when it begins to move and heave up the people itself, when it is found (as soon it must) that attempts to suppress it by ecclesiastical authority must fail; then the

statesman must either make up his mind that Christ did institute insular Churches, and *forbade* active communion between what He compared to branches of one tree, to members of one body, and that the State is supreme to the Church, and may quell her judgments and crush her feelings at will; or he *must* begin to reflect whether it is not a solemn duty to God, and to what he considers His Church, to free his conscience from the blame of standing in the way, between her and that desirable unity, between his national and the Catholic Church. For if this union would, or might, take place, were it not for obstacles which he may remove, but will not, the imputation must lie at his door. It is quite certain, for instance, that so long as the odious statutes of Premunire exist, all intercourse of a friendly character between those recognised as bishops by the State and the Apostolic See of Rome is cut off; and yet only through the latter could a return to unity be hoped for.

The statesman will probably say that these statutes are of a political character, and have reference to temporal interests; that, in other words, they were framed (in part anterior to the Reformation) to prevent or check papal encroachments upon the rights of the Crown or nation; and that such constitutional safeguards must be jealously kept up. Let us allow this reasoning; what follows? that, at most, so much restraint may be kept up, as is necessary for these supposed political

purposes, but no more. If these statutes be of a twofold character, as they undoubtedly are, one part affecting the temporal influence of the Holy See, the other its spiritual rights, as the apostolic chair of Peter, the temporal legislature may, if in its wisdom it so judge, keep up such parts of the law as relate to the first matter, but this cannot warrant the continuation of what can effect only the second. Nor of this has it a right to constitute itself a judge. If it acknowledge the existence of a Church, it surely must leave *it* to decide what is necessary for its own *spiritual* interests; and, if it be agreed on all hands, that unity, if feasible, is most desirable (to say no more) in Christendom, the plain line of duty is to leave that Church unshackled, in its efforts to bring it about; while the State takes care of the real or imaginary political dangers,—" ne quid detrimenti *respublica* capiat." That the two considerations may be kept separate, and that active communion may exist with foreign Churches, free from all dangers to the civil power, the examples of France or Germany will suffice to prove. It is not found, in either, that perfect religious unity exposes the constitutional rights of a people, or the sovereign prerogatives of an emperor, to the slightest jeopardy. But if the legislature should say, that it is not on political, but on religious grounds, that it is resolved to bar all possible intercourse between its Church and the rulers of ours, then the great question must be

brought at once forward,—*has* the legislature any such right, that of mere strength and oppression apart, to decide a religious question of that magnitude, to determine at once that the Church of this country never *ought* to be in communion with the *orbis terrarum*,—the Universal Church? If the civil authority be competent to decide this point, it, and not the Church, is the supreme judge ecclesiastical: and let that Church look well to its position. If the state have no such jurisdiction, it is *de facto* usurping it, and let the Church look well to its rights.

IV. What is the duty then of those who have undertaken the cause of that Church? And, first, what is their intention? Mr. Newman writes as follows:—"If she (Rome) does reform, ... *then it will be our Church's duty at once to join in communion with the continental Churches,* WHATEVER POLITICIANS AT HOME MAY SAY TO IT, AND WHATEVER STEPS THE CIVIL POWER MAY TAKE IN CONSEQUENCE." *B. C. Jan.* 1840, p. 88. I will read the first conditional words, if you please, in this sense: "Whenever the time shall come when we feel that we ought," which (as I may show later) is their fair meaning. At any rate, the clear determination is here expressed, not to be deterred, by political decrees or civil consequences, from active communion, whenever present *religious* obstacles (real or apparent) shall be removed. Of

the holders of such deliberate intentions, what are the duties? They seem to me to be as follows:

1. To the Church of Christ—the paramount duty of healing the present lamentable schism. Not to be deterred by past failures, nor by present difficulties, nor by future sufferings, but to begin at once, and to persevere energetically in such measures as *directly* tend to the work of religious reunion; not to say that the time is not yet come, but to hasten it forward, and strive with Providence for the shortening of the days of trial.

2. To the people. Their predecessors in the ministry have done much to mislead the population of this country on the subject of religion, especially regarding the true character of the Roman Church, and its differences with the Anglican. The prejudices thus engendered have stood, and yet stand, much in the way of their reconciliation. It is the duty of actual members of the same ministry, to undo the mischief, remove the obstacle, and, by every means, bring back the people to kindlier, juster and truer views.

3. To the State: to draw a clear line between its functions and those of the Church; to apply at once to its rulers for revision of all that interferes with *true* religious liberty, that is, with the power of claiming all the privileges of the Christian system—unity, universal charity, Catholic communion, from which the nation is now debarred by the cramping and straitening enactments of an

oppressive age. And if this shall fail, who will say but that a sterner duty may arise? There are moments, and they are matter of prophecy as well as of history, when men are obliged to say: "if it be just in the sight of God, to hear you rather than God, judge ye;"* or when they are called upon to scan with more than usual nicety the things that are Cæsar's and the things that are God's, and be jealous that they allot to the one nothing that belongs to the other. The *regale* and the *pontificale* do not always run together, and one may have to choose between the two; not indeed to rob the former of a single tittle of its due rights, but to secure the latter from all encroachment. The best security against having such moments, is a readiness to have them.

4. To their own Church. If they love her as they say, they must not cease in their efforts to make her what they wish her. It is for them to press their superiors, with determined importunity, to take the work in hand, or to allow others to do it; they must turn their learning, their counsel, their prudence, to influencing the hearts of their brethren; and in all this there must be no delay, no relaxation of effort.

V. And now we come, my Lord, to the consideration of what more immediately concerns ourselves. What is our duty in regard to this matter? Before entering upon this topic, let me say a few

* Acts iv. 19.

words on one above alluded to, because it enters necessarily into the estimate of demands made upon us. I allude to the frequent and strong denunciations which we meet in Oxford writers of Rome as she now is; and not to multiply examples, which are *too* numerous, I will give the words preceding my last quotation from the *British Critic*. "Till she ceases to be what she practically is, a union is impossible between her and England; but if she does reform," &c. This seems, at first sight, a bar to all *present* hopes, and in some respects to all future ones. Your Lordship will remember, that I understood the latter part of these words in a milder sense, and I am now going to justify it. This repeated wish that Rome may be different from what she is, may be satisfied in various ways; and though expressed in one sense, may find an answer in another. For instance, blots may be removed from an object, by being wiped away from the medium through which it was viewed, and which transferred its own defects to the object; and in like manner, Rome may soon appear and be very different to sincere eyes, that look at her now through distorted representations, or descriptions highly coloured in some parts, or even through slighter misunderstandings. Again, a part of a picture may seem dark and unpleasant, not because its colours are so, but because sufficient light is not cast upon it; and so many things appear cheerless and painful to others, not because

truly so, but because they want proper light to be cast upon them, by reasonable explanation. Or the defect may arise from the very position of the spectator. A pious and intelligent person observed to me the other day, that our devotions to the saints might be compared to their representations on our beautiful old church windows; when seen from without, they present but dark surfaces and ill-shaped outlines; when from within the church, they seem to glow with the rich and varied light of heaven, in pure and majestic forms. Thus I am by no means terrified, or dejected, when I find this condition for unity strongly and repeatedly expressed; because I know how much of it depends upon the manner of looking at things, more than on the things themselves. And your Lordship and myself have known sufficient instances of persons, whose prejudices had been most violent against Rome, but were overcome in Rome, and by Rome itself.

To this point I may have to return. I am now speaking of *our* duties, and with reference to these I have started the subject. Are *we* then called upon to meet those who are advancing towards us, in their complaints against the practices of devotion, &c. allowed or tolerated in Catholic countries, even such as we might not ourselves suggest to the poor and ignorant? I put this question, because from much that has been written, I should conclude that a wish is felt by some, that we should

be more disposed to find fault with our brethren abroad, than we are. Without egoism I may say, that I have been particularly exposed to the censure; and regret has been expressed to me, both publicly and privately, that I should, for instance, have attempted to explain or defend certain phrases employed in popular devotions. Now the answer is, that my defence of such phrases has been no more than that they may bear, however strong, a truly orthodox, catholic, and devout sense. I have never, to my knowledge, spoken of the expediency, or suitableness of such phrases, particularly with reference to the impression they may make on others. There is no inconsistency in this. I may resolutely maintain, that a person is no idolator because he performs certain acts of reverence before a sacred image, though I might wish him to refrain from them under given circumstances, as when misunderstanding might ensue. And as to expressions, surely they who openly adopt the principle, that in interpreting their Articles they are bound, in the first place, to do so in accordance with Catholic doctrine, and in the second, to do almost any violence to the words to effect this agreement, cannot refuse us the right to bring all our formularies of devotion into harmony with our formularies of belief, and to explain phrases in the Pope's Encyclical, by the decisions of his own See.

Upon this principle, I answer, that we must not be expected to join in condemnation of practices

(I mean sanctioned practices) which we believe to be perfectly reconcilable with sound doctrine. We must explain, to the utmost; we must compare some parts of the system with others; we must press for the most favourable construction; we must judge of meaning by actions and by feelings. As far as concerns whatever the Church sanctions or clearly permits, I feel sure (as every Catholic must) that all can be thus placed in a right view. On individual cases of abuse or local malpractices, on all that results from the depravity of human nature or its frailties, let us willingly acknowledge that we have reason for grief or for shame; but let it not be in a criminating spirit. Let the communion of saints on earth, be a communion of sorrow, of confusion, of compunction, as well as of gladder sympathies; let us bear each other's burthens, but let us not measure too jealously how much is others' share. When we refuse to join in even a partial condemnation of Rome, it is not that we believe its sacred precincts exempt from the temptations of humanity, or from sin, or from crime. We have both of us too often heard the noble eloquence of the Roman pulpit, against the vices of society and of individuals, for either of us to dream of this. But wherefore should we become the criminators or censors of our own mother, who is so dear to us, and has on us so many claims of gratitude? Why should we not leave God to

judge the wicked that are there, and turn ourselves rather to the many examples of self-denial, of zeal, of charity, and of exalted piety, which are nowhere else to be found so fair? My feeling is; let condemnation be by each one on himself, and let our looks abroad be in charity and affection. Let us English Catholics mourn over our own backwardness in much that is of duty, our own coldness in much that is of zeal. Let us English clergy lament our deficiencies in much of that ecclesiastical tone and spirit, which abroad gives regularity to the sacerdotal ministry, and influences the commonest actions and habits of the priest. And let our friends on the other side feel as they think just, on the evils of their own state, lay and clerical—we will not interfere with them—but let them refrain themselves, and let them allow us to abstain, from the presumptuous task of judging and censuring the Apostolic Church. When Divine Providence shall have brought us together, it will be time to mingle our tears in any common mourning; there will be family occasions of sorrow; there will be domestic secrets communicated that may cause general pain; there may be discoveries of frailty which will lead to Catholic sympathy. When brothers and sisters have quarrelled, and have re-embraced in reconciliation, each is anxious to take upon himself as much of the blame as possible, and to discharge the others of

it. At least all of us will be glad to forget that we were ever estranged, or why.*

I have thus indirectly stated what would seem to be our first duty; to offer cheerfully and honestly every explanation in our power, and point out where our real doctrines are mistaken, where they are confounded with mere permissive practices, and where they may be liable to abuse. The sooner a clear and distinct understanding can be come to upon these matters, whether by personal conference, or by writing, the better for the cause. There exist at this moment, I am sure, grievous misapprehensions in the minds of serious men connected with the new movement, upon this point, which it seems to me a more direct and friendly intercourse, directed to this purpose, could remove. I had thought of illustrating the matter by a few cases; but I see that I should be led away, and should involve myself in a complicated discussion, which might be premature.

* Such is the feeling of the profound and pious Möhler. After observing that no Catholic can refuse to acknowledge, with humiliation, the corruptions of past ages; that this proof lies in the very existence of Protestantism, which could not have arisen without them, he thus concludes: "Apprenez donc une fois, ô Protestants, à mesurer la grandeur des abus que vous nous reprochez sur la grandeur de vos propres égaremens. *Voilà le terrain sur lequel les deux églises se rencontreront un jour, et se donneront la main. Dans le sentiment de notre faute commune, nous devons nous écrier et les uns et les autres: 'Nous avons tous manqué, l'Eglise seul ne peut faillir; nous avons tous pêché, l'Eglise seule est pure de toute souillure.'*"—Symbolique, tome ii. § xxxvii.

A second duty seems likewise suggested by what has been already said,—that of self-improvement, and, where necessary, self-reformation. To allude to this must, I think, be sufficient. I leave it to others better qualified to point out specific matters to which our attention ought to be directed. Let each one judge himself by the standard of better times, and he will find enough to do, in bringing himself up to it. But certain it is, that for men to become enamoured of our religion, she must be presented to them here, where alone the majority of them can see her, arrayed in all her heavenly charms, majestic in the temple, devout at the altar, pure and sublime in the pulpit; moral and highly disciplined in the college; Christian and pious in the school; severe and mortified in the monastery; exemplary in the confraternity; zealous and generous in the noble; edifying in the gentle; humble and resigned in the poor; charitable with wealth; cheerful and orderly with penury; chaste and honest in youth; holy and venerable in age: every where reviving Catholic institutions, making peace and content to spring, as flowers, beneath her tread, blessing and blessed in the happiness which she diffuses, and the compensations which she abundantly distributes. In securing all this, there is work for us all, for priest and people, for rich and poor.

Further, it cannot be presumptuous to inculcate on all such as desire to forward this good and glorious work, that violence, however cloaked as

zeal, will not have on it the blessings promised to meekness and charity. Harshness of language, sarcasm, and bitterness, will not either convince the understanding, or win the affections. On the other hand, trustfulness in the sincerity of others, and in the goodness of their motives, hopefulness in the result of our endeavours, however frequently foiled, patience under repeated disappointments, unwearied kindness and charity in spite of rebuffs, zeal that abates not in warmth, though it meet with but thorough coldness; in fine, the spirit of Christ and of his Church, will not fail, sooner or later, to triumph over obstacles that seemed insurmountable, and obtain results that appeared most hopeless.

VI. A natural question here presents itself: what facilities appear, in the present state of things, for bringing about so happy a consummation, as the reunion of England to the Catholic Church, beyond what have before existed, and particularly under Archbishop Laud, or Wake? It strikes me, many. First, in former times men's minds were on the road from, rather than to, Catholic truth,—they were gradually receding from, not approaching to the Church of Christ. Dislike of rule was on the increase, not on the wane; the tide of the Reformation was rolling in, not ebbing quietly back, and restoring to the Church its usurped territories. Those men who made the attempt had no hold on public opinion,—the strength of the

nation was not with them, nay, it was against them. Things are now greatly changed: religious lawlessness has gone through all its phases, and men are beginning to look out for a steady light, and a secure harbour. For a time the nakedness and solitude of religion had a charm; that time is passed; they want in their religion a comforter as well as a monitor,—a solace as much as a duty,—a balm to the heart as well as a prick to the conscience; many minds are jealous of that tenderness and contemplativeness which the Catholic Church alone can inspire; they want its daily comforts, and its hourly recollections, to cheer the weary way of life.

2. Then, in former times, the hugging patronage of the State cramped and suffocated, rather than warmed and supported, the energies of the Established Church. There was little idea of ecclesiastical action independent of lay control,—the government was considered the closest friend and ally of that Church; nay, the two seemed eternally wedded in indissoluble bonds. Now the friendship is cooled, and separation or divorce may easily take place; that is, should civil rulers place themselves in the way of what seems necessary, for the religious welfare of the country.

3. But coming nearer to the point, it seems to me that the advances made at the present time have less of a worldly taint about them,—less of the spirit of bargain, or, to use a gentler phrase,

of wishing for good terms, than at any other time. While, on the one hand, the Roman Church cannot be tempted, by promises of relief to her oppressed children in this country, to any compromise of dignity, the Church of England is not under that temporal pressure, which might urge her members to seek, through religious unity, foreign political alliance against domestic rebels. The wants of the English Church, which the desirers of unity feel, are entirely spiritual; the want, above all, of that very unity itself, and of all its consolations. And hence I sincerely believe, that there will be more earnestness and more eagerness to attain it, than ever there was before.

4. Again, I think the form in which the desire is felt is a guarantee against former causes of failure. Those who express it do so in a spirit of humility and confession. They do not want to treat the matter as one of equal advantages, but as conscious that their position is an unhappy one; that they have lost much which they will regain through us; that there are strong appearances against them in their very separation; and that reunion with the Holy See will give vigour and energy to a languid and sickly existence.* Such men must be disposed to go to the full extent of sacrifice of personal feelings, necessary to accomplish their sacred purpose. And here, again, I

* See the well-known Letter to the *Univers*.

will refrain from proofs and illustrations which might be premature.

5. A still more promising circumstance I think your Lordship with me will consider, the plan which the eventful Tract, No. 90, has pursued, and in which Mr. Warde, Mr. Oakley, and even Dr. Pusey, have agreed. I allude to the method of bringing their doctrines into accordance with ours, by explanation. A foreign priest has pointed out to us a valuable document for our consideration,—" Bossuet's Reply to the Pope,"—when consulted on the best method of reconciling the followers of the Augsburg Confession with the Holy See. The learned Bishop observes, that Providence had allowed so much Catholic truth to be preserved in that Confession, that full advantage should be taken of the circumstance: that no *retractations* should be demanded, but an explanation of the Confession in accordance with Catholic doctrines. Now, for such a method as this, the way is in part prepared, by the demonstration that such interpretation may be given of the most difficult Articles, as will strip them of all contradiction to the decrees of the Tridentine Synod. The same method may be pursued on other points; and much pain may thus be spared to individuals, and much difficulty to the Church.

VII. I would not, in this sketch, allude to the difficulties which may, nay *must* arise, in effecting this great object, did I not fear that were I to omit

them, many would consider me a visionary enthusiast, who shuts his eyes to the practicability of his views. I say then that difficulties *must* arise, in the prosecution of this holy work. The enemy of good will not allow an end to be put to dissension and disunion, without strong and repeated efforts to prevent it. Our own imperfections and passions will often thwart our attempts; the consideration of interests of a more worldly character will be no doubt inopportunely thrust in; persons too with less pure and noble views will interfere: and that great spoiler of all good religious designs, THE WORLD, with its coldness and indifference, with its sneers and sarcasms, with its evil maxims and false liberalities, with its fear of new restraints, and its hatred of severe virtue, will form a strong party, and a host of contradiction. In addition to this there will be more serious obstacles: sincere scruples about particular practices, unwillingness to surrender certain forms, the complicated questions of hierarchical arrangements, orders, and clerical discipline; and many others which it is needless to anticipate, because they will soon enough show themselves. This much is enough to prove that it is not with the eyes of an enthusiast that I am disposed to look at the future. The way is dreary and wearisome; the promised land lies beyond a desert; in this there will be rough rocks and flat sands, each difficult to pass for different reasons,—the one will require energy, the

other unwearied plodding perseverance; there will be fiery serpents and decoying seducers; there will be cursing prophets, and armed giants; there will be waterless wastes, and bitter fountains; there will be disappointment, and murmuring, and falling back; the tables may be more than once dashed to the ground and broken, and again re-written: and at last there may be death on Nebo, in wistful sight, without hope of personal possession, of "the land o'erflowing with milk and honey." Thank God, our manna will not fail us, nor our hopes, nor our trust in the Lord of Israel; we will toil and faint with our brethren, we will fight and pray with the Church of God, and we will calmly leave the result and the reward in His blessed hands. Our path cannot be more trying nor more discouraging than was the apostles' before us, nor more thorny than our Lord's. "The disciple is not better than the Master."

That the return of this country (through its Established Church) to the Catholic Unity, would put an end to religious dissent and interior feud, I feel no doubt. By two ways, the population of the country would be worked upon for its moral improvement—the rural districts through parochial influence, the denser population of towns, or manufacturing districts, through monastic institutions. Experience has now shown that the country population are ready to receive without murmuring, indeed with pleasure, the Catholic views propounded

from Oxford, and indeed even more, when taught through regular parochial instruction. Add the richness and majesty of the Catholic Ritual, the variety of its sublime services, the touching offices of peculiar seasons, the numberless institutions for charitable objects and its hourly sanctifications of domestic life, and dissent would break in pieces beneath the silent action of universal attraction, and its fragments gather round its all-powerful principle. Then send forth men of mortified looks and placid demeanour, girt with the cord of a St. Francis, or bearing on their breasts the seal of Christ's passion, as on their countenances the marks of its mortification (like the followers of Venerable Paul of the Cross), whose garb allows no comparison of superior fineness or affected poverty, with that of the poorest that surround them, but whose attire is at once majestic and coarse, and with bare heads and feet, holding the emblem of redemption, let them preach judgment, and death, and future punishment, and penance, and justice, and chastity. And they will be heard by thousands with awe and reverence; and we shall see wonders of reformation, pure faith revive with better lives, and the head converted by the converted heart.

I will now conclude, sincerely apologizing to your Lordship, on the one hand for the lengthiness of this letter, and on the other for the incompleteness of its views. In one point I trust that none (however he may have differed with me so far) will

refuse to join me—in daily and fervent supplication to the God of peace, that He will deign to direct our hearts and conduct towards the accomplishment of this noble end. Let us interest the entire Church in our favour: the surest pledge which we can have that God intends to grant a blessing, is His inspiring His spouse to entreat Him. The golden sceptre will be stretched out to her, the moment she goes in to pray for "her own soul and for her people."*

I am ever,
My dear Lord,
With sincere regard,
Yours sincerely in Christ,
NICHOLAS,
Bishop of Melipotamus.

St. Mary's College,
Feast of St. Matthew, 1841.

* Est. v. 2. "Dona mihi animam meam pro qua rogo, et populum meum pro quo obsecro." vii. 3.

LONDON: RICHARDS, PRINTER, 100, ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

GTU Library
3 2400 00781 1163

499/CDX